00111882

THE
ASIATIC SOCIETY OF BOMBAY
TOWN HALL, BOMBAY-1.

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 25 June, 2016

MANUAL

OF

HISTORICO-CRITICAL INTRODUCTION

TO THE CANONICAL SCRIPTURES OF

THE OLD TESTAMENT.

BY

KARL FRIEDRICH KEIL,

DOCTOR AND PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY.

111882

Translated from the Second Edition,

WITH SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES FROM BLEEK AND OTHERS,

By GEORGE C. M. DOUGLAS, B.A., D.D.,

PROFESSOR OF HEBREW AND OLD TESTAMENT EXEGESIS IN THE FREE CHURCH COLLEGE, GLASGOW.

VOL. I.

EDINBURGH:

T. & T. CLARK, 38, GEORGE STREET.

MDCCCLXIX.

1869

00111882

TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE.

DURING the last twenty-five years there has manifestly been an increasing interest expressed among us in all questions connected with the authority of Scripture, the extent of the Canon and the circumstances of its formation, the age of the books contained in it, and the condition of their text. Possibly it will be said that many of these questions have been raised or have been discussed thoughtlessly, superficially, or irreverently; and so far as this may have been the case, I deplore it. But I am not prepared to admit that this has been the prevailing spirit in such inquiries; and in a world of sin, I prefer to meet painful cases of honest doubt, rather than sleepy, indifferent acquiescence in a traditional profession of the truth. I cannot therefore take a gloomy view of the prospects of religion amongst us, merely because the religious atmosphere is full of excitement and controversy on these subjects.

But, feeling an earnest desire to assist those who have been interested in these inquiries (at least so far as these concern the Old Testament, which is the larger and the more difficult portion of the volume of revelation), and especially to assist students of theology in a matter of such great and growing importance, I turned my eyes toward Germany. I did so, not only on account of the scholarly character of its divines in general; but also, and more particularly, because German students of theology have for a century been running a course of experience which may be unspeakably valuable to us. These questions were first raised among them, the prevailing impression or tendency was to give a sceptical reply; but gradually the weight of accurate learning and of sound judgment has come to be more and more upon the other side. At my spare moments

for two or three years past, I have been translating *Keil's* Introduction, as a specimen of a book that gives clear, full, condensed information upon these questions, written by a man of unshaken faith in the Word of God. At the same time, it seemed to me desirable to present to students the views of some respectable and thoughtful writer of a different school; and as I translated, I inserted whatever I considered interesting in the opinions of the late *Friedrich Bleek*,[1] a man of high position among the followers of *De Wette* and the better sceptical school. Besides, I have occasionally made other additions, chiefly in cases where I thought it important to indicate that I differed from *Keil;* though it must not be inferred that I invariably agree with him where I have not indicated the contrary. All these insertions are distinctly marked by means of square brackets.

In my translation I have endeavoured to lean towards a literal rendering; yet I have habitually taken the liberty of breaking down the extremely long sentences in which German writers are apt to indulge.

I have taken all possible care to verify the quotations from Scripture, and to correct any errors which I observed. I trust that the reader will find the advantage of this, and that he will also derive advantage from the endeavours of the printer and the publisher to do full justice to the work, notwithstanding many difficulties inseparable from its execution.

I have only to add, that I shall be thankful to receive criticisms, corrections, and advice; as my desire simply is to put into the student's hands a Manual which shall be really satisfactory and useful to him.

[1] "Einleitung in das Alte Testament, von *Friedrich Bleek.* Herausgegeben von *Joh. F. Bleek* und *Ad. Kamphausen:*" Berlin, 1860. Had I known that *Mr. Venables* was to publish a translation of this work, as he has done in the course of the present year, I might have somewhat modified my references to *Bleek*, or have introduced some other writer more frequently to the English reader; but there would certainly have been no essential change in the extracted supplemental matter.

GLASGOW, *August* 1869.

AUTHOR'S PREFACE

IN republishing in an enlarged form, after the lapse of five years, this Manual of Introduction to the Old Testament, I can only repeat what I already said in the prefatory note to the first edition on the subject of its aim and tendency.

The problem which I set before myself as I worked at it was not merely to collect, to complete, and to present compendiously the results of older and of more recent sound historico-critical investigations into the origin, the genuineness, the integrity, and the credibility of those Scriptures of the Old Testament on which Neological Scepticism has cast doubts, and which it has stripped of historical and theological claims to respect. But along with this, it has been my effort to vindicate for Old Testament Isagogic the rank of a theological science, by an organic division and arrangement of the material which works on Introduction handle, in correspondence with the gradual origination and the historical transmission of the Old Testament; so that this science might form the indispensable foundation on which to work out historically, dogmatically, and apologetically, the revealed religion of the Old Testament. Unprejudiced persons, familiar with this science, must decide how far I have succeeded in solving this problem. It becomes me only to acknowledge that I have paid conscientious regard to whatever has been achieved already in this domain, and that I have gratefully made use of the solid investigations of my predecessors, after having carefully tested them; but yet that I have not neglected, while mentioning those earlier works of which I have made use, to accept only what I deemed true and susceptible of proof out of no small number of special works and discussions, and to combat with scientific weapons the opinions of my

opponents, and every view which seemed to me untenable. Purely uncritical assumptions, unfounded assertions, and hypotheses and productions which are already antiquated (like *Sörensen's* investigations concerning the Pentateuch), have been thrown aside without going into a minute refutation, or have even been entirely ignored.

I have remained true to these principles whilst elaborating this second edition. But in order that the book might still more thoroughly correspond to its aim, which is to treat of the whole materials for Old Testament Introduction in as brief and condensed a form as possible, I have added in an Appendix an Introduction to the whole of the apocryphal books of the Old Testament, as these are found in Greek, Latin, or German Bibles; and I have also marked this addition in the title of the book. [All this has been omitted in the translation, as really not belonging to the Old Testament. Should there be a demand for it on literary grounds, it may be added in another edition.] And I have made further changes, in order to carry out with greater strictness the historical character of the treatment of the Isagogic material. The contents of the Third Part in the first edition are now transferred so as to be the Fourth Section of the Second Part. The history of the dogmatic representations of the Canon among the Jews, as well as the history of the respect paid to the Old Testament in the Christian Church, the use made of it, and the treatment accorded to it, have been combined with the historical development of the doctrine of the Canon, as to its compass and its component parts, in the Synagogue and in the Christian Church. I have endeavoured to give greater fulness to the history of the Canon of the Old Testament, as regards its ecclesiastical authority and the treatment accorded to it, by giving more complete information as to the symbolical determinations of the various Churches on the subject of the compass of the Canon, and as to exegetical labours or commentaries on the Old Testament. And, finally, I have given attention to books and papers which have appeared for the last five years on Introduction to the Old Testament, and on its criticism and exposition, and have gleaned from them to the best of my ability. This has necessitated many little changes and additions, and has enabled me to make not a few improvements.

But in order that this extension of the materials might not lead

to any enlargement of the size of the book, it appeared to be necessary to economize space, partly by closer printing (though without selecting a smaller type); partly by systematic abbreviation of authors' names and the titles of works which are frequently quoted, as often as they recurred [a contrivance which has been discarded, for the sake of the English reader, except in the case of such words as can scarcely be mistaken, such as the frequent *Einl.* for *Einleitung*; *sq.* and *sqq.*, or their German and English equivalents *f.* and *ff.*; *comp.* for the often recurring word *compare*; and the names of two authors, *Hengstenberg* and *Hävernick*, who are mentioned with peculiar frequency]; and finally, partly by omitting certain opinions which have already become antiquated, as also some other unessential observations. In this way I have succeeded in keeping within the number of sheets in the first edition, nay, actually to have rather fewer pages.

Thus may this Manual again in its altered shape meet with kindly acceptance on the part of the friends of the Divine Word. And may God the Lord be pleased to add His blessing, that henceforward it may still contribute its share to establish men more firmly in the truth of His Word as it was spoken by Moses and the prophets. To Him be praise and glory evermore!

DORPAT, *December* 15, 1868.

CONTENTS.

PREPARATORY.

PAGE

§ 1–3. The Idea and the Problem. Division of the Subject. History and Literature of Historico-Critical Introduction to the Old Testament, . 1

FIRST PART.

ORIGIN AND GENUINENESS OF THE CANONICAL WRITINGS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

FIRST SECTION.

OF THE OLD TESTAMENT LITERATURE IN GENERAL.

CHAPTER I.

RISE, GROWTH, PRIME, AND DECAY OF THE HEBREW LITERATURE.

§ 4. Beginnings of the Practice of Writing among the Hebrews, . . 15
§ 5. The Hebrew Literature in the Age of Moses, ... 17
§ 6, 7. Development of the Hebrew Literature after Moses till the Time of David; under Solomon and the Kings until the Exile, . . 19
§ 8. Decay and Termination of the Hebrew Literature after the Exile, . 25

CHAPTER II.

THE LANGUAGES OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

§ 9. Names and Origin, ... 26
§ 10. General Character of the Shemitic Languages, ... 29
§ 11, 12. The Aramaic Language; the Arabic, ... 30
§ 13, 14. The Hebrew Language, its Age and Character; its Course of Development, ... 38

PAGE

§ 15–17. The Language of the Age of Moses; of the Age of David and Solomon; of the Age of the Exile, ... 44
§ 18. How the Hebrew died out as the National Language, ... 67

SECOND SECTION.

ORIGIN AND GENUINENESS OF THE INDIVIDUAL BOOKS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

§ 19. General Classification of these Books, ... 71

FIRST DIVISION.

THE FIVE BOOKS OF MOSES, OR THE LAW.

§ 20, 21. Names and Division: Contents of the Five Books, . . 72
§ 22, 23. Aim and Plan: Sources of Information, or Documents, in the Pentateuch, ... 77
§ 24, 25. Nature of the imaginary Fundamental Document: Basis of the Hypothesis of Supplements; the Divine Names, ... 84
§ 26, 27. The Marks by which the two Documents are said to be distinguishable: Contradictions and varying Legends; Difference in the Circle of Ideas, and in the *usus loquendi*, ... 104
§ 28–30. Relation of Deuteronomy to the Earlier Books; in respect of its Contents, and of its *usus loquendi*, ... 136
§ 31. The Historical Point of View of the Laws in Deuteronomy, . . 147
§ 32, 33. Unity of the Pentateuch; its Author, ... 155
§ 34, 35. Historical Testimonies to the fact that Moses composed the Pentateuch; Testimony of the Synagogue and of the Christian Church, 164
§ 36. Assaults upon the Genuineness of the Pentateuch, and Defences of it, 178
§ 37–39. Objections to the Genuineness: its Unhistorical Character; Traces of a Later Age; remaining General Objections, . . . 184

SECOND DIVISION.

THE PROPHETICAL WRITINGS.

CHAPTER I.

THE PROPHETICAL HISTORICAL BOOKS.

§ 40. Peculiarity of the Historical Books composed by the Prophets, . 197

THE PROPHETICAL HISTORICAL BOOKS INDIVIDUALLY.

PAGE

§ 41–45. The Book of *Joshua:* Name, Contents, and Object; Independence and Unity of the Book; Date of Composition; Sources of Information, and Historical Character, ... 201

§ 46–50. The Book of *Judges:* Contents, Title, and Object; Unity of the Composition; Chronology of the Book; Date and Author; Sources of Information, and Historical Character, ... 214

§ 51–55. The Books of *Samuel:* Name, Division, Contents, and Object; Composition and Unity; Date and Author; Sources of Information; Historical Character, ... 230

§ 56–60. The Books of *Kings:* Name, Division, Contents, and Object; Unity and Independence; Date and Author; Sources of Information; Historical Character, ... 251

CHAPTER II.

THE PROPHETICAL PREDICTIVE BOOKS.

§ 61. The Position of Prophecy in the Theocracy, ... 266

§ 62. Nature of Prophecy in reference to Subject-matter and Form, . 271

§ 63. The Literature of the Prophecies, ... 278

A. THE GREATER PROPHETS.

§ 64, 65. *Isaiah:* his Person; Contents and Arrangement of his Book, . 281

§ 66–70. Date of Composition and Genuineness of Ch. i.–xii., xiii.–xxvii., xxviii.–xxxv.; upon Ch. xxxvi.–xxxix., ... 291

§ 71, 72. Date of Composition and Genuineness of Ch. xl.–lxvi.; Origin of [illegible] of the Prophecies of Isaiah, ... 320

[illegible] *Jeremiah:* his Person; Contents and Structure of his Book; [illegible]uineness and Integrity of his Prophecies; Origin of his Book, . 332

[illegible] his Person; Contents and Arrangement of his Book; [illegible]uineness of his Prophecies; Origination of his Book, . . 353

B. THE TWELVE MINOR PROPHETS.

[illegible] and Arrangement, ... 364

[illegible]: his Person; his Book, ... 368

[illegible] his Person, his Age; his Book, ... 375

[illegible] his Person; his Book, ... 384

[illegible] Contents and Date of his Prophecy, . . . 389

[illegible]: Contents and Character of the Book; Author and Date of [illegible] 394

[illegible]: his Person; his Book, ... 403

PAGE

§ 93, 94. *Nahum:* his Person; his Book, ... 406
§ 95, 96. *Habakkuk:* his Person and Age; his Book, . . . 410
§ 97, 98. *Zephaniah:* his Person; his Book, ... 415
§ 99, 100. *Haggai:* his Person; his Book, ... 419
§ 101–103. *Zechariah:* his Person; Contents of his Book; Genuineness of Ch. ix.–xiv., ... 421
§ 104, 105. *Malachi:* his Person and Age; his Book, . . . 431

THIRD DIVISION.

THE HAGIOGRAPHA, OR HOLY WRITINGS.

§ 106. Classification of them, ... 435

CHAPTER I.

THE POETICAL WRITINGS.

§ 107, 108. Hebrew Poetry: its Character, its Species, its Form, . . 436
§ 109–114. The *Psalms:* Titles; Contents and Divisions; Superscriptions, and Notes appended; Authors; Age of the Anonymous Psalms; Origin of the Collection, ... 449
§ 115–119. The *Proverbs of Solomon:* Names and Character; Contents and Component Parts; Author of ch. i.–xxix., and of the Appendices Ch. xxx. xxxi.; Origin of the Book, ... 468
§ 120–123. The Book of *Job:* its Idea, its Contents, its Arrangement; Matter and Form of the Poem; its Age and Author; its Unity and Integrity, ... 481
§ 124, 125. The *Song of Songs:* its Name and Author; its Contents and Object, ... 500
§ 126, 127. The Book of *Lamentations:* its Name, Contents, and Form; its Author, and the Date of its Composition, ... 508
§ 128–130. The Book of *Ecclesiastes:* its Name and Character; its Contents, Plan, and Object; its Author, and the Date of its Composition, . 512

INTRODUCTORY OBSERVATIONS.

§ 1. *The Idea and the Problem of Historico-critical Introduction to the Old Testament.*

HISTORICO-CRITICAL *Introduction* (*εἰσαγωγή, isagoge seu introductio*) to the Old Testament is the science of the historical foundations of the Old Testament Canon; since these are the subject-matter of those historico-critical investigations on which a scientific theologian's use of the Old Testament as the Canon of that revelation which preceded the coming of Christ must rest, and by which this use on the part of the Church is shown to be justifiable. Now canonical authority is attributed to that volume, on the supposition that it contains the genuine documents of the revelation of the old covenant, that they have been transmitted to us uninjured, and that they have ever been respected in the Church as canonical. Out of this arises the double problem for theology: to investigate historically, and to justify against all assaults of the opponents of biblical revelation—*first*, the origin and the condition of these writings individually, and their collection and union into one organic whole containing many members; and *secondly*, the integrity, or uninjured transmission, of this whole within the Jewish Synagogue and the Christian Church down to the present time.

To discuss the *origin* and *genuineness* of the Old Testament as one whole and in its several parts, we must, 1*st*, contemplate the entire ancient Hebrew literature, viewed as a language and in its course of development, so far as this will at once give us a general knowledge of the origin and character of the individual books; 2*d*, go into particulars, and investigate the origin, the condition, and the genuineness of the whole canonical writings; and 3*d*, discover how these books

were collected and united into one completed whole, and what is the character of this collection in reference to its extent, its constituent elements, and its arrangement.

To show the *integrity* of the Old Testament Canon, we must set forth the history of the preservation, the propagation, the diffusion, and the treatment of the Old Testament by the Church at the principal epochs from the date of the close of the Canon till recent times. This will present to us, 1*st*, not only the changes of the text in external and internal form, but also the critical helps for restoring a genuine text, as given in the records which attest the text in different ages; 2*d*, the historical testimonies to its canonicity.

The unity of this double problem is due to the fact that both its parts are concerned with that one object whose origination, transmission, and canonical value we are to point out. And the scientific principle of all the historical and critical investigations by which the problem is to be solved, the principle from which they proceed, and to which they bring us back, is preserved in the concept of *the Canon*, which links the Church to the Old Testament, and ensures to historico-critical Introduction the character of an independent theological science (1). It never can attain to sure and stable results if it denies its true historico-critical character at any point; for instance, by surrendering the guidance of its investigations to ready-made conceptions of inspiration borrowed from systematic theology, or to critical prejudices which deny all immediate divine revelation on *à priori* grounds (2); or by conceding to so-called internal arguments, which are always more or less subjective, that foremost place to which well-authenticated historical testimonies are entitled (3).

(1) In the most rudimentary age of our science it received this name Introduction. *Cassiodorus* [who died later than 562], in his preface to his "Institutiones divin. literarum," calls them "introductorii libri," and styles his predecessors in this field "introductores scripturæ div." The Greek *Adrianus* also [at an uncertain date, perhaps the middle of the fifth century; it is chiefly an introduction to Biblical rhetoric: see *Bleek*, p. 6] already entitles his work upon the peculiarities of Scripture, εἰσαγωγὴ εἰς τὰς θείας γραφάς. It was only in last century that the pretty vague conception of Introduction was limited suitably to the nature of the subject, and the topics embraced in it as it was gradually forming, by the addition "historico-critical,"—

a term which has reference to the matter and also to the form of this study. Finally, in the most recent period, this name that has been so long in use has been rejected as "unsuitable, betokening an unscientific age and view," on the part of rationalistic writers (like *Credner* and *Ed. Reuss* on the New Testament, and on the Old by *Herm. Hupfeld*, über Begriff u. Methode d. sogen. bibl. Einleitung, Marburg 1844); and they propose instead to follow Rich. Simon, and to call it "History of the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, or of Biblical Literature," pp. 3, 12 f. Certainly if historico-critical Introduction is nothing more than "a compilation useful for Biblical investigation of certain things necessary to be known before we can rightly view and deal with the Bible as a whole," which "is distinguished with tolerable exactness from other courses of study connected with literary investigations," only "by its reference to the history and historical relations and peculiarities of the Biblical books" (*De Wette*, Einl. § 1), then it is destitute equally of scientific principle and of internal organic connection of parts. On the contrary, if it is transformed into a history of Biblical literature, and even, according to a false abstract separation of the divine and the human in the canonical writings, merely "the letter" of them,—that is, their "external natural origin and connection," their "temporary shell or husk,"—be assigned to historical investigation and criticism (*Hupfeld*, p. 25 f.); then, along with any theological character, there is at the same time taken away from this study any positive importance for theology, which indeed it had already lost by the treatment of the rationalists. Nay, though we hold fast the inspiration of Scripture, with *Delitzsch* (Begriff u. Methode der sogen. bibl. u. insbes. alttestl. Einleitung, Zeitschrift f. Protestantism u. Kirche, N. S. xxviii. p. 133 ff.) and *H. Aug. Hahn* (in *Herzog's* Real-Encyclop. art. Einleitung in d. A. T.), still their transformation of historico-critical Introduction into a "history of Old Testament literary matter" thoroughly alters the position which this science has hitherto occupied in relation to evangelical Protestant theology, and its importance for the principle which Protestants maintain as to Scripture, without attaining any real compensating advantage to theological science in general, or to this branch of it in particular. We might say, further, that we need first to create an Old Testament *literary matter*, as distinguished from Old Testament *Scripture*, by hypotheses like *Ewald's*; and that if we strictly carry out the division of Old Testament literature according to the periods of its development, so as to meet this demand for the historical treatment of it, not only are portions torn asunder which are as a matter of fact most closely linked together, but also, and in

connection with this, the clear knowledge of the idea of the Old Testament Canon and of its organic structure becomes obscured.

(2) The *former* procedure makes dogmatic theology the basis of Introduction; whereas, inversely, Introduction should furnish us with the premisses for the dogmatic determination and development of the Holy Scriptures and the Word of God by means of the historico-critical indications of the authenticity and credibility (*fides humana et divina*) of the canonical Scriptures. The *latter*, which "contemplates the Bible as a historical phenomenon in the same rank as other similar phenomena" (*De Wette*, § 4), imparts to Introduction a tendency hostile to theology and the Bible, by which truth never can be advanced.

(3) Compare *Kleinert*, üb. d. Echtheit der Jesaj. Weisagg. (Berlin 1829), i. p. xxxviii. ff.; *Drechsler*, d. Unwissenschaftlichk. im Gebiete d. Alttestamentlichen Kritik (Leipzig 1837), p. 31 ff.

§ 2. *Division of the Subject.*

The problem in the science of Introduction (§ 1) guides us plainly to the right distribution of its parts, which are two, corresponding to the two great questions that call for discussion. The *First Part* comprises the investigation of the *origin and genuineness of the Old Testament;* and it deals with—

I. *The literature in general:* 1*st*, according to its course of formation and its character; 2*d*, according to the nature of its language.

II. *The origin and genuineness of the individual books*, according to their three classes in the Hebrew Canon: 1*st*, the Pentateuch; 2*d*, the prophetical writings, both the historical and the predictive; 3*d*, the remaining writings or Hagiographa, including the poetical, the prophetical (Daniel), and the historical.

III. *The origination of the Canon*, or the collection and union of these writings into one completed whole.

The *Second Part* gives a critical history of the transmission of the Old Testament, and of the treatment accorded to it, as a completed collection, in reference to—

I. *Its fundamental principles*, in a short historical survey of the propagation and cultivation of the science of the Hebrew language.

II. *Its means:* 1*st*, in a general view and representation of the continued diffusion of the original text, (*a*) by unfolding the changes which time produced in its outward form, (*b*) by a description of the manuscripts; 2*d*, in the diffusion of the Old Testament by the ancient versions, with notices of their origination, nature, and history.

III. *Its influence on the contents of the Old Testament Scriptures*, in a brief exhibition of the critical labours about the text, (*a*) unprinted, (*b*) printed.

IV. *Its ecclesiastical authority and treatment:* 1*st*, in *the doctrine of the Canon*—that is, the views of the Synagogue and the Christian Church (*a*) as to its extent and its constituent parts, (*b*) as to its higher or divine authority; 2*d*, in the consequent *hermeneutical treatment* of it (*a*) by the Jews, (*b*) in the Christian Church (1).

(1) The division, which has been long in use in books on the subject, into *general* and *special* introduction, with opposite arrangements of these as respectively the first and second parts, rests on no clear fixed principle, and is connected with the vague and fluctuating definitions of the entire study.

§ 3. *History and Literature.*

E. Fr. K. Rosenmüller, Handbuch f. d. Literatur d. bibl. Krit. u. Exegese, 4 vols. Göttingen 1797–1800 (in vols. i. and ii.). *Gottlob Wilh. Meyer*, Geschichte der Schrifterklärung seit d. Wiederherstellung d. Wissenschaften, 5 vols. Göttingen 1802–9. *W. Gesenius*, bibl. Einleitung, in *Ersch u. Gruber* allgemeine Encyclopædia der Wissensch., x Theil; also printed separately, Bibel, etc., Leipzig 1823. *Hävernick*, Handbuch d. hist. krit. Einl. in d. Alte Test. i. 1, p. 8 ff., 2d ed. *Hupfeld*, üb. Begriff u. Methode, p. 39 ff.

Historico-critical Introduction to the Old Testament was unknown in the early Church and during the middle ages. In those times the preponderating scientific interests of the Church-teachers were directed towards the contents of Scripture, to the defence of the faith against heathens and Jews, and to the development of dogma, and its justification against heretics; in which procedure its divine authority or inspiration was unanimously accepted: in fact, this was combated or

rejected, even by the heretics and the enemies of Christianity, only on dogmatic grounds. Besides, most of them wanted that knowledge of the Hebrew language which is indispensable to success in these historico-critical researches. All, therefore, that was accomplished in reference to this before the Reformation, was confined to hermeneutical rules, determinations about the biblical and canonical books of Scripture, with notices of their authors and their character, and accounts of translations and expositors; which constitute mere unimportant preparatory labours for our course of study (1).

(1) So the works: *Augustine* (died in 430), de doctrina christiana, libb. iv., in the third vol. of the Benedictine edition; published separately by *G. Calixtus*, Helmstädt 1629, 2d ed. 1655; and c. var. lectt. animadver. illustr. J. C. B. Tegius, Lipsiæ 1769, especially books ii. and iii. *Junilii*, episc. Afric. (in the year 550), de partibus divinæ legis libri duo ad Primasium episc. in max. Biblioth. patrum, tom. x. pp. 339–350; separately by *Gastius*, Basileæ 1546; then Parisiis 1556; Francofurti 1603; also almost entirely transferred to *Flacius*, clavis Script. S. tract ii., only the first book relating to this subject. *Magn. Aurel. Cassiodorus* (died later than 562), institutiones divinarum literarum, in Opp. ed. *Garet*, Rothomag. 1679, Venetiis 1729, fol. ii. 508–27; separately edited by *Jac. Pamelius*, Antverp. 1565, Parisiis 1575 (the first book containing an Introduction to the Scriptures). *Nicol. Lyrani* (died 1340), notitia de libris bibl. canonicis et non canon., prefixed to his Postilla perpetua, Antverp. 1634, fol.—To Isagogic, in the more recent sense, the following works do not belong: *Tichonius*, de septem regulis; *Adriani* isagogæ sacr. litt.; *Eucherii* pia ad S. Script. opuscula; and *Vincentii Lerin.* commonitoria duo. Compare *Hupfeld*, p. 46 ff.

The Reformation, which rested everything on Scripture, first wakened up an all-embracing and enduring zeal for Biblical studies of every kind. At first, indeed, the predominant object was dogmatical discussion and the establishment of a system of doctrine; and so little attention was bestowed on investigations relating to Introduction (since there was no dispute as to the divine authority of Holy Scripture), that for a considerable time men were content with unimportant performances in this domain of science (2). Yet already in the seventeenth century, owing partly to the controversies between

[Roman] Catholics and Protestants as to the Old Testament Canon and the integrity of the Hebrew text, partly to the felt necessity for profound investigation of Scripture, which is deeply rooted in the very essence of Protestantism, certain departments of Introduction, especially the history of the text, had been so profoundly and comprehensively investigated, that the labours of the two *Buxtorfs*, *Lud. Capellus*, *Joh. Morinus*, *Brian Walton*, *Humphrey Hody*, and *Rich. Simon*, are still unrivalled for fulness of erudition and penetrating acuteness (3).

(2) On the [Roman] Catholic side:—*Santes Pagninus Lucensis* (Dominican, died in 1541), Isagoge ad ss. literas, Lugduni 1536, fol.; exactiss. dilig. recogn., Coloniæ 1540, fol. *Sixtus Senensis* (ord. prædic., died in 1599), bibliotheca sancta ex præcipuis cathol. eccles. autoribus collecta, Venetiis 1566, fol., and often; edited by *F. Hay*, Lugd. Batavorum 1591, 4to; latest at Naples, 1742. *L. Ellies Du-Pin* (Prof. in Paris, died in 1718), Dissertation préliminaire ou Prolégomènes sur la Bible, t. i., Paris 1701, 4to; treating only of matters of General Introduction. About other [Roman] Catholic Introductions, such as *Antonii* a matre Dei præludia isagogica ad ss. librorum intelligentiam, Lugduni 1669, fol., and *Claudii Frassenii*, disquisitiones biblic. iv. libris compreh., Lutetiæ Paris. 1682, 4to, see *Rosenmüller*, i. 97 ff.

On the Protestant side:—*Pet. Palladius* (Prof. at Copenhagen and Bishop of Zealand, died in 1560), isagoge in libr. proph. et apost., Vitebergæ 1557; last edition, 1601. *And. Rivetus* (Prof. at Leyden and Breda, died in 1643), isagoge ad Scripturam S. Vet. et Novi Test., Lugd. Bat. 1627, 4to. *Mich. Walther* (died in 1662 as General Superintendent at Lüneberg), officina biblica, noviter adaperta, Lipsiæ 1636, 4to; enlarged, Vitebergæ 1668, 4to; 1703, fol. *Abr. Calov* (died in 1686), criticus s. bibl. de S. Scripturæ auctoritate, canone, lingua origin., fontium puritate ac verss. præcip., etc., Vitebergæ 1643, 4to. *Jo. Heinr. Heidegger* (Prof. at Zürich, died in 1698), enchiridion biblicum ἱερομνημονικόν, lectioni sacræ, analysi generali singulorum Vet. et Nov. Testamenti librorum, etc., inserviens, Tiguri 1681; and often, at Jena 1723. *Jo. Henr. Hottinger* (Prof. at Heidelberg, died in 1667), Thesaurus philologicus s. clavis Scripturæ, Tiguri 1649, 4to; 3d ed. 1696. [*Bleek*, p. 9, says, "Hottinger was deeply read in Rabbinical, Talmudical, and Arabic writings, and has given many extracts from them in the writers' own words; and especially on this account the work is useful still." He adds to the

list here, p. 10, *August Pfeiffer* (Prof. at Wittenberg and Leipzig, Superintendent at Lübeck, died in 1698), Critica Sacra, Dresden 1680, 4to; often reprinted, last at Altorf 1751, 8vo.] *Jo. Leusden* (Prof. at Utrecht, died in 1699, Philologus Ebræus, Ultrajecti 1656; 5th ed. 1696, 4to: and his Philologus Ebræo-mixtus, *ib.* 1663; 4th ed. Basel 1739, 4to.

(3) *Jo. Buxtorf* (the father, Prof. at Basel, died in 1629), Tiberias, s. commentarius Masorethicus, Basileæ 1620, fol. (supplement to his Rabbinical Bible); enlarged and improved ed., Tiberias, s. comm. Mas. triplex, historicus, didacticus, criticus . . . recogn. et add. non paucis locupl. a *Jo. Buxtorfio* fil., ed. nov. accur. *Jo. Jac. Buxtorfio* nep., Basileæ 1665, fol. and 4to.

Lud. Cappellus (Cappel, Prof. at Saumur, died in 1658): 1. Arcanum punctationis revelatum, ed. *Thom. Erpenius*, Lugd. Batavorum 1624, 4to; again, with Vindiciæ arcani punct. revel., in the Appendix to his Comment. et notæ crit. in Vet. Test., Amstelodami 1689, fol. 2. Diatriba de veris et antiquis Ebræorum literis, *ib.* 1645, 12mo. 3. Critica Sacra, s. de variis quæ in sacris Vet. Test. libris occurrunt lectionibus, libri vi., ed. op. *Joan. Cappelli*, Lutetiæ Paris. 1650, fol.; a new edition, with many additions by *G. J. L. Vogel*, t. i., Halæ 1775; *J. G. Sharfenberg*, t. ii. iii., 1778, 1786. For the history of this work, compare *Rosenmüller*, i. 467 ff. In opposition to it, *Jo. Buxtorfi* (the son, Prof. at Basel, died in 1664), Anticritica, s. vindiciæ veritatis Hebraicæ adv. L. Cappelli criticam quam vocat sacram ejusque defensionem, etc., Basileæ 1653, 4to.

Jo. Morinus (Father of the Oratory at Paris, at first a Protestant, died in 1659), Exercitationum biblicarum de Hebræi Græcique textus sinceritate libri duo, Parisiis 1669, fol.; later, along with the exercitationes ecclesiast., 1686. Compare *Rosenmüller*, i. 440 ff.

Brian Walton (died in 1661, Bishop of Chester), Prolegomena to the Polyglott Bible, London 1657, fol.; edited separately, *Br. Waltoni* Angli apparatus chronologico-topographico-philologicus (ed. *J. H. Heidegger*), Tiguri 1673, fol.; also *Br. Waltoni* in Biblia polyglot. Prolegomena, Præf. *Jo. Aug. Dathe*, Lipsiæ 1777.

Humfredi Hody (Prof. at Oxford, died in 1706), de Bibliorum textibus originalibus, versionibus Græcis et Latina vulgata, libri iv., præmittitur *Aristeæ* historia Græce et Lat., Oxon. 1705, fol.

Richard Simon (Father of the Oratory at Paris, died in 1712), Histoire critique du V. Testament, Paris 1678: confiscated, then reprinted (with many blunders) at Amsterdam; and in a Latin translation, Historia critica Vet. Test., etc., a *Natal. Alb. de Versé*, *ib.* 1681; new ed. 1685; last correct original edition, Rotterdam 1685, 4to.

Compare *Rosenmüller*, i. 115 ff.; and *K. H. Graf*, Strassb. Beitrr. z. d. Theol. Wissensch. (1847), i. p. 171 ff. [*Bleek*, p. 12 ff., says the best replies and discussions in connection with this work of Simon were: 1. A treatise by *Ezekiel Spanheim*, to be found in the Rotterdam edition, along with an answer by *Simon;* 2. *Vossius*, writing in the interest of the Septuagint, since the chief value of Simon's researches is as to the critical character of the witnesses for the Old Testament, together with his judgments upon the exegetical and critical writers on the Old Testament; 3. Sentimens de quelques theologiens de Hollande sur l'histoire critique, etc., by *Le Clerc*, 1685, 1711, and again in 1779, edited by Corrodi; and a Defénse des Sentimens, etc., 1686; 4. *Du Pin* (died in 1719), Dissertations préliminaires ou Prolegomènes sur la Bible, which appeared first as a supplement to his work on ecclesiastical authors.]

Isagogic became more important, when the doubts advanced by *Benedict Spinoza* and the English naturalists [deists] (4) as to the genuineness, credibility, and divine inspiration of the Old Testament were transplanted by *Semler* to the soil of Germany (5). These were clothed in scientific form by his successors, *J. G. Eichhorn*, *G. Lor. Bauer*, *J. Sev. Vater*, *W. Mart. Lebr. de Wette*, *Leonh. Bertholdt*, *Wil. Gesenius*, etc.; were cultivated more and more under the name of Criticism, with learning and acuteness; and for a time enjoyed a course of triumphs over the defenders of the faith of the Church (6). But at length *E. W. Hengstenberg*, *H. A. Chr. Hävernick*, and others, esteemed for their commanding erudition, entered into conflict with this falsely-renowned Criticism, gained successive victories over it, and by their achievements laid the foundation of a re-establishment of the science of Introduction, which corresponds as well with the scientific demands of Biblical Criticism as with the religious necessities of the Church (7).

(4) *Benedict Spinoza* (died in 1677), tractatus theologico-politicus, Hamburg 1670, 4to (denying revelation, miracles, and prophecies, the genuineness of the Pentateuch and other books of the Old Testament, and the existence of a Canon previous to the time of the Maccabees). *Thomas Hobbes* (died in 1679), in his Leviathan, London 1651, fol.; a Latin translation, Amstelodami 1670. Compare *Lechler*, Geschichte des englischen Deismus, Stuttgart 1841, p. 86 ff.

These and other assaults were met by *Jo. Gottlob Carpzov* (Prof.

at Leipzig, then Superint. at Lübeck; died in 1767), in two works which treat of Introduction in all its extent with profound learning and circumspection: 1. Introductio ad libros canonicos Bibliorum Vet. Test. omnes, Lipsiæ 1721, third ed. 1741, 4to (Special Introduction). 2. Critica Sacra Vet. Test., parte i. circa textum orig., ii. c. versiones, iii. c. Pseudocriticam *Guil. Whistoni* solicita, Lipsiæ 1728; 2d ed. 1748, 4to (General Introd.).

(5) *Joh. Sal. Semler* (Prof. at Halle, died in 1791), Abhandlung von freier Untersuchung des Kanon, 4 Thle., Halle 1771–75; and Apparatus ad liberal. Vet. Test. interpretat., *ibid.* 1773. [*Bleek*, p. 16, says he learned from Simon, and agreed very much with him. "Yet his criticism has more a predominantly negative character, as he wages war with received representations, and undermines them, without setting up anything positive in their place."]

(6) The whole of Introduction has been treated by *Joh. Gottfr. Eichhorn* (Prof. at Göttingen, died in 1827), Einleitung in d. Alte Testament, 3 Thle., Leipzig 1780–83; fourth ed. Göttingen 1823–25, in 5 vols.; also his Introduction to the Apocryphal Writings of the Old Test., Leipzig 1795. In opposition to him, *Joh. Dav. Michaelis* (Prof. at Göttingen, died in 1791), Einleit. in d. göttl. Schriften d. Alten Bundes, Th. i., Hamburg 1787, 4to (incomplete). [*Bleek*, pp. 16–18, says *G. Herder* (died in 1803) was familiar with the spirit of the East, and had a rich fancy, an attractive manner of representation, and a receptive religious style of mind; and that he revived a taste for the study of the Old Testament, which Semler could not do, by his Briefe üb. d. Studium d. Theologie, and his Geist d. hebräischen Poesie, and his Bearbeitung d. Hohenliedes. He considers *Eichhorn* to have been of Herder's spirit, and pronounces him very diligent and clear, somewhat too rhetorical, appreciating the æsthetical rather than the properly religious and theocratic, and the relation of the Old Testament to the Christian faith, and least of all able to comprehend the prophets: he says the latest edition of his Introduction is much enlarged, yet not essentially altered in the same degree, as he took little account of the investigations of other learned men. *J. D. Michaelis*, he says, was less popular than his colleague Eichhorn, and therefore abandoned the idea of writing an Introduction after he had published the volume on the Pentateuch and Job; in which, however, as in his other works, there is much that is valuable and instructive.] *Joh. Jahn* ([Roman] Catholic Prof. at Vienna, died in 1816), Einleitung in d. göttl. BB. des Alten Bundes, Wien 1793; 2d ed. re-written, 1802–3, 2 Thle. in 3 vols. Introductio in libros Vet. Fœderis in comp. red., *ibid.* 1805; 2d ed. 1815, worked up

anew by *Ackerman* 1825, [in 1826 according to *Bleek*, p. 19, and a 2d ed. 1839. He says, *ibid.*, that Jahn's contributions to the science are always deserving of consideration, though generally his argumentation is wanting in penetrating depth, and his mode of representation is wanting in liveliness.] Thoroughly attached to *Eichhorn* was *Georg Lor. Bauer* (Prof. at Altdorf and Heidelberg, died in 1806), Entw. e. hist. krit. Einleit. in d. Schriften d. Alten Test., Nürnberg u. Altdorf 1794; 3d ed. improved, 1806; and of the same school, yet with some independence, *G. Chr. W. Augusti* (Prof. and Consistorial Councillor, died in 1841), Grundriss e. hist. krit. Einleit. ins Alte Test., Leipzig 1806; 2d ed. 1827. [*Bleek*, p. 21, says this work has an easy, pleasant way of representing the ideas of the writer; but there is not much in him that is exactly original.] Rationalistic criticism was cultivated into historical scepticism by *W. M. Lebr. de Wette* (died in 1849 as Prof. at Basel), Beiträge zur Einl. in d. Alte Test., in two small volumes, Halle 1806, 1807, 1812; and Lehrbuch d. hist. krit. Einl. in d. kanon. u. apocryph. BB. d. Alten Test., Berlin 1817; 6th enlarged and improved ed. 1845; 7th (not) improved ed. 1852. [A translation into English, but with many alterations, was made by the late Theodore Parker in the United States. *Bleek*, pp. 21–23, who greatly admires De Wette, contrasts his religion and respect and value for the Bible with the spirit of Gramberg, von Bohlen, and Hartmann; yet he admits that his theology in the early editions was very negative, and that to the last he held fast to certain suppositions, such as the late origin of Hebrew literature. Contrasting him with Bertholdt, who is to be noticed immediately, he says, "De Wette is distinguished the more by condensation, combined with richness of materials and comprehensiveness of representation." "The work is very serviceable as a handbook . . ., since he communicates the results of investigations on the topics of which he treats, and the proofs of these, in a condensed, brief manner, with abundant literature and other materials."] A prolix collection of rationalistic opinions has been furnished by *Leonh. Bertholdt* (Prof. at Erlangen, died in 1822), histor. krit. Einl. in d. sämmtl. kanon. u. apocryph. Schriften des Alten u. Neuen Test., Erlangen 1812–19, 6 vols. [*Bleek*, p. 21, says the books of Scripture are inconveniently mixed up in classes, the prophetical being reckoned poetical books; and that he wants depth and taste, yet not acuteness. "The work is specially useful in this way, that in it, in single sections, particularly in the Special Introduction, many different views are brought together and decided on; though it cannot exactly lay claim to being complete in this respect, or to being well-proportioned." *A. Kuenen* (Prof. at Leyden), Historic

critique des livres de l'Ancien Testament, traduite par *M. A. Pierson*, Paris 1866.] Others confined their critical operations to single books of the Old Testament; these will be noticed later, at the appropriate places.

(7) *Ernst Wilhelm Hengstenberg*, Beiträge z. Einleitung ins Alte Test., 3 vols., Berlin 1831–39. *Heinr. And. Christ. Hävernick* (Prof. at Königsberg, died 1845), Handbuch der hist. krit. Einl. in d. Alte Testament, vols. i. ii. [historical and prophetical books], in 4 parts; vol. iii. [poetical books, Job chiefly from Hävernick's papers] wrought up by *C. Fr. Keil*, Erlangen 1836–49; vol. i., pts. 1 and 2, in a 2d improved ed. by *Keil*, 1854–5. As to special writings by other representatives of this movement, see afterwards on the individual books of the Old Testament. [*Bleek*, pp. 24–27, gives praise to this class of writers, among whom he reckons also *Kleinert*, *Drechsler*, *F. H. Ranke*, *Caspari*, *Kurtz*, *Stier*, etc., whose influence he considers very healthy; though they have gone to an extreme in attributing the entire critical movement to unbelief, and have erred "in asserting that the Old Testament is an absolute revelation, and in placing it almost or altogether on a level with the New."]

To these works there attach themselves the following writers who belong to the [Roman] Catholic Church:—*J. G. Herbst* (Prof. at Tübingen, died 1836), hist. krit. Einl. in die heil. Schriften des A. Test., edited by *Ben. Welte*, vol. i. (General Introd.), vol. ii. in two parts (Special Introd.), and a third part (Special Introd. to the deutero-canonical books) by *B. Welte*, Karlsruhe u. Freiburg 1840–44. *J. M. Augustin Scholz* (Prof. at Bonn, died in 1852), Einl. in d. heil. Schriften des Alten u. Neuen Test., 3 vols., Köln 1845–48 (containing only the Introd. to the Old Testament). [*Bleek*, p. 20, says that "*Herbst* belonged to the more liberal investigators, but that his sentiments cannot be precisely known, for things have been added and suppressed where too much had been conceded to modern criticism, as entirely on Isaiah, Lamentations, Obadiah, Jonah; and the last part, on the Apocrypha, is wholly from the pen of the editor, who is of the strictest school, but knows how to defend his opinions with learning and acuteness."]

[In this review of leading writers, *Bleek* attaches much more importance, among Roman Catholic writers, to *Movers* (died in 1856), who would have written still more important articles than some on Chronicles, Jeremiah, and the Pentateuch, but for a certain timidity in reference to his Church by which he was restrained. *Bleek* also, pp. 23–4, notices the influence among Protestants of *Ewald*, and of *Hitzig*, who belongs to the same school, sufficiently positive in a sense,

but very fanciful and self-confident; agreeing with the more purely negative school of De Wette that Moses is not the author of the Pentateuch, and that Daniel and the latter part of Isaiah did not proceed from the writers whose names they bear.]

Finally, the most widely known Introductory work that has appeared in England is that of *Thomas Hartwell Horne* (at Cambridge), "An Introd. to the Critical Study and Knowledge of the Scriptures," London 1818, 3 vols.; 10th ed. revised, corrected, etc., 1856, 4 vols. The first vol. contains a summary of the evidence for the genuineness, authenticity, uncorrupted preservation, and inspiration of the Holy Scriptures; the second, re-written by *Sam. Davidson*, D.D., has the separate title, "The Text of the Old Test. Considered, with a treatise on sacred interpretation, and a brief introduction to the Old Testament books and the Apocrypha;" the third contains Biblical geography and antiquities; the fourth is the Introd. to the New Testament. Compare *Bleek* in the Theol. Studien und Krit. 1856, p. 343 ff. [Another edition of the second volume was soon after published, the editor of which was the Rev. John Ayre, since Dr. Davidson's views on many points were very different from those of Horne, and of many who wished to have the work. Dr. *Davidson* has since published an Introduction to the Old Testament, 3 vols., London 1862.]

FIRST PART.

ORIGIN AND GENUINENESS OF THE CANONICAL WRITINGS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

FIRST SECTION.

OF THE OLD TESTAMENT LITERATURE IN GENERAL.

CHAPTER I.

RISE, GROWTH, PRIME, AND DECAY OF THE HEBREW LITERATURE.

§ 4. *Beginnings of the Practice of Writing among the Hebrews.*

ALTHOUGH the divine revelations of the Old Testament begin with the call of Abraham and the leadings of the patriarchs, and though Genesis thus commences with the creation and the traditions of the most remote times, yet these times must not be expected to furnish us with any literature. The discovery and first use of the art of writing (1) is certainly at least as old as the times of Abraham (2); yet in the patriarchal age we meet with no absolutely certain traces of its employment by the Hebrews (3). But undoubtedly they made this art their own during their stay in Egypt; for here already we find Israelite officers who derived their name שֹׁטְרִים from *writing* (4). All the more we may assume that Moses, the founder of the theocracy, brought up as he was in the Egyptian court, and instructed in all the wisdom of the Egyptians (Acts vii. 22), not only was acquainted with it, but was so practised in it that he could set down in writing the laws which were given to his people, and so ensure them against that disfiguration which is unavoidable in the case of mere oral tradition (5). Nay, in the time of Moses the art of writing is presupposed, and mentioned as being already well known and in common use among the people (6).

(1) Compare *Hengstenb.* Beitrr. ii. 415 ff.; *Häv.* Einl. i. 1, § 43 ff. Hypotheses as to the origin of writing: *Jos. Lev. Saalschütz*, Forsch. im Gebiete der hebr. ägypt. Archäol. i., zur Gesch. der Buchstabenschrift, Königsberg 1838. *Ferd. Hitzig*, d. Erfindung des Alphabets, Zürch 1840, fol. *Just. Olshausen*, üb. d. Ursprung des Alphabets, Kiel 1841. *Heinr. Wuttke*, Enstehung u. Beschaffenheit des fönikisch-hebr. Alphabets, in the Zeitschrift der deutsch-morgenl. Gesellschaft, xi. p. 75 ff.

(2) *Ewald*, ausführl. Lehrbuch der hebr. Sprache, Leipzig 1855, p. 22, "The writing of the Hebrews is from a remote age, and not at all a new creation of Moses and his time." A very high antiquity must also be assigned to the use of writing, in consequence of the fact that the Hindoos obtained their writing from the Shemites,—a fact already suspected by *Rich. Lepsius* (üb. d. Anordnung u. Verwandtschaft des Semit., Ind., Æthiop., Altpers. u. Alt-ägypt. Alphabets, in d. "Zwei sprachvergl. Abhandlungen," Berlin 1836), but first, a short time ago, based firmly on palæography by *A. Weber* (üb. den Semit. Ursprung des Indischen Alphabets, in the Zeitschrift d. deutsch-morgenl. Gesellschaft, x. p. 389 ff.).

(3) The signet-ring of Judah (Gen. xxxviii. 18, 25) indubitably presupposes the use of writing (*Häv.* p. 276; *Hengstb.* p. 452; *Ewald*, Geschichte, i. 67; *Cäs. v. Lengerke*, Kanaan, i. p. xxvi.); and this testimony is not to be set aside by the objection of *Ewald* and *v. Lengerke*, that this account is an embellishment of the story which has proceeded from a later writer. Only there is the possibility that Judah bought this signet-ring to be an ornament, and not for actual use.

(4) Ex. v. 6–19. The fact cannot be contradicted, that שֹׁטֵר originally means "scribe," γραμματεύς (Sept.); compare *Häv.* p. 277 f., *Hengstb.* p. 449 ff., *Keil* on Josh. i. 10.

(5) Compare *Hengstb.* p. 476 ff.

(6) Ex. xvii. 14, xxiv. 4, xxxiv. 27, 28; Lev. xix. 28; Num. v. 23, xi. 26, xvii. 17, 18, xxxiii. 2; Deut. xxxi. 9, 19, 22, 24. Compare *Hengstb.* p. 456 ff.; *Delitzsch* on Genesis, i. p. 22. Even *Ewald* (Geschichte, i. 68) and *v. Lengerke* (p. xxxi. f.) acknowledge that in the age of Moses there was "already a widely-diffused knowledge of writing among the more cultivated part of the people."

§ 5. *The Hebrew Literature in the Age of Moses.*

Moses, the founder of the Israelite state, and the mediator of the old covenant, is also the creator of the Old Testament literature. To him is attributed not only the reduction to writing of the whole legislation which takes its name from him, but also the composition in writing of the whole Pentateuch, both its historical and its poetical portions (§ 33). The Hebrews, indeed, had already many laws and principles of jurisprudence before the time of Moses; but these rested mostly upon old usage, without being extended in writing. We cannot now discover how much of the historical accounts from remote antiquity and from the age of the patriarchs had been handed down by word of mouth, and how much had been written down earlier than the time of Moses (1). Even the most ancient national songs and poems (the song of Lamech, Gen. iv. 23 f.; the blessing of Jacob, Gen. xlix.) were no doubt at first transmitted orally from one generation to another. The simplicity of patriarchal life could dispense with writing; and in Egypt, when the Israelites had grown to be a numerous race, they were subjected by the Pharaohs to hard bondage, in the midst of which no literature could flourish. Literature was created by Moses, whom God had furnished with all the qualifications requisite for the effective discharge of the duties to which he was called.

Called by the Lord to be the founder of that divine commonwealth in which the promises given to the patriarchs were to be realized, Moses not only led Israel out of Egypt, and gave them commandments, statutes, and judgments; he also wrote these in "the Book of the Covenant" (Ex. xvii. 12, xxiv. 4, 7). Besides, he collected and arranged the traditions of primitive and earlier times, according to the theocratic principle, into a historical introduction to the theocracy. And finally, he entered in the Book of the Law all the weighty events of his own time; not merely for the purpose of laying that historical foundation without which the legislation could not be fully understood, but also and chiefly on account of the prophetically didactic character of the history of the covenant people, who were placed under his immediate guidance and discipline. That is to say, the divine administration of righteousness and grace, its two

characteristics which always remain in equipoise, comes out so distinctly as to form a prophetic type for all ages, and teaches by examples, as the Law teaches by commands and promises.

Yet, in addition to this Law and these historical statements, the books of Moses contain prophetic utterances, such as Balaam's (Num. xxii.–xxiv.); and poetical productions, called forth in the soul of Moses, and in those of other theocratic men, by the great deeds of the Lord on behalf of Israel,—such as Moses' song of praise at the Red Sea (Ex. xv.), his parting song and his blessing (Deut. xxxii. xxxiii.), and single fragments of songs out of "The Book of the Wars of the Lord" (Num. xxi. 14, 17, 27–30) (2). They thus unite within themselves all the branches of literature; and these not only in their beginnings and first weak attempts, but cultivated and brought to perfection in a manner becoming to the creative spirit of their author, so as to impress their form upon all following generations, and to furnish a model to them (3).

(1) The conjectures of *Ewald* (Gesch. i. 73 f.) and *v. Lengerke* (*ibid.*) as to traces of annals or historical works among other nations, anterior to the historical literature of Israel, are thoroughly precarious.

(2) "The Book of the Wars of the Lord" is not a foreign historical source (*J. D. Michaelis*), but an Israelite collection of songs upon the victories over the heathen, obtained by the Lord's almighty assistance, perhaps with interspersed historical notices of these victories; compare *Hengstb.* Beiträge, iii. 223–225. *Ewald* (Gesch. i. 88) holds it to be an ancient historical work, containing a collection not only of triumphal songs in reference to the conquests of the people, but also of all the reminiscences of the victorious expeditions of Moses and Joshua (?). See the older opinions in *Wolf*, biblioth. Hebr. ii. 216 sqq.

(3) *Delitzsch*, Genesis, i. p. 14 f.: "All the historical composition, the prophecy, the chokma ['wisdom'], and the poetry of Israel, have their foundation and their substance in the Law of Moses. Though *De Wette* (Einl. § 163) calls it a senseless notion, that Moses should have left it to all succeeding authors to copy him, this dependence of later literature will not mislead us as to the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. For as, in general, every creative commencement rules all the developments of succeeding times; so we might expect with certainty a whole crop of fertile germs for after ages from that unique

period of redemption, and from the greatest of all the prophets. Besides, the writers in later times retain each his own peculiar excellences. David is a greater master of lyric song, and Isaiah of the prophetic word; but we should have had neither David nor Isaiah without the Law of Moses."

§ 6. *Development of the Hebrew Literature after Moses till the time of David.*

It was through Moses that the Lord chose Israel, and constituted them the people of God; and through the Law and the pattern of Moses their literature received a character corresponding with their destiny. The Hebrew literature became a *sacred literature*, close alongside of which a worldly literature could not spring up and flourish. After the time of Moses the first steps were, in one direction, the continuation of historical notes of the more weighty occurrences; in another, the further cultivation of poetry.

The age of Joshua, in which, by the mighty aid of their covenant God, the people conquered and inherited the land promised to the patriarchs, immediately afforded abundant materials for historical composition, which lie before us wrought up in the book of Joshua. In the following period, that of the Judges, with its alternations of hostile oppression and glorious deliverance, the theocratic life fell gradually away, and along with the life the culture; so that, in the interval between the death of Joshua and Samuel's time, we can expect only private descriptions of the glorious victories of individual judges, and of other memorable events in the national or the family life. It was first under Samuel that theocratic literature, along with the entire theocratic life, was re-awakened and revived. His "schools of the prophets" became nurseries for producing and cherishing a living theocratic sentiment, and in a variety of ways promoted the cultivation of sacred literature. And though the greater part of the prophets after Samuel may not have proceeded from these schools, since the gift of the Divine Spirit was not restricted to them; still the schools diffused among the people the susceptibility for receiving this Spirit, and contributed not a little to make it possible that an uninterrupted succession of prophets should arise from that time forward. But the prophets, as divinely constituted watchmen of the

Law, and as the men who announced the purposes of Jehovah, did not only influence mightily the continued education of this divine commonwealth by the force of the Word; they also followed, with the glance of seers, the whole proceedings of the people and their rulers, and took care not merely to transmit faithfully the memorable revelations made to them, but also, in general, to have the history of their time rightly comprehended and recorded (1).

After the exalted strains of poetry to which Moses and his contemporaries gave utterance, there is evidence in the highly poetical triumphal song of Deborah (Judg. v.) that it flourished nobly in the restless times of the Judges, and that it still re-echoed under Eli in pious Hannah's song of praise (1 Sam. ii.) (2). Yet it reached the highest pitch of cultivation (3) by means of the richly endowed poetical spirit of David. For, both as a simple shepherd and as a mighty king, he consecrated to sacred poetry the entire force of his profound mind, which had been educated for greatness in the school of affliction; and the multitude of his songs, and the introduction of them into public worship, secured the triumph of sacred lyrics over all other forms of poetry among the people, and incited the most gifted of his contemporaries, such as Asaph and several of the sons of Korah, to emulate him in sacred song (4).

(1) The references in 1 Chron. xxix. 29 make it clear that prophets wrote the history of David. We may assume the same of Saul's administration. Also our book of Judges gives the history of that period, as extracted from older contemporary records, in a prophetic spirit, and so wrought up by a prophet.

(2) These are not to be regarded as the only songs of this period. According to Josh. x. 13, 2 Sam. i. 18, there was a whole collection of songs in praise of theocratic heroes and saints,—a sort of book for the people, "The Book of Jashar," that is, "The Book of the Upright," or of men true to the theocracy: it was planned so early as under Joshua, and was continued down to the time of David. See *Keil's* Commentary on Joshua, p. 158; also *Wolf*, biblioth. Hebr. ii. 219 sqq., for the older views. Traces of popular poetry at other times occur in Jotham's parable (Judg. ix. 7 ff.), in Samson's riddles and songs (Judg. xiv. 14, xv. 16), and in the popular songs of triumph (Judg. xvi. 23 f.; 1 Sam. xviii. 6, 7).

(3) On the subject of the influence of the schools of the prophets

on the cultivation of sacred lyric poetry, compare *Hengstb.* Ps. iv., p. 550 ff.; *Häv.* Einl. iii. p. 9.

(4) Compare *Hengstb.* p. 552 f.

§ 7. *Progress of the Cultivation of Hebrew Literature under Solomon and the Kings until the Exile.*

The theocracy unfolded its highest earthly glories under the peaceful rule of Solomon, and during this period poetry overspread the whole domain of intellectual life. Solomon himself was endowed with great wisdom and with a rich poetic spirit, and he surpassed his father as much in the abundance of his poetical productions as in his royal splendour (1). His lyrics, Ps. lxxii. and cxxvii., and his Song of Songs, whose contents are drawn entirely from his feelings, are distinguished from David's compositions by their completely rounded form, and by the great repose and objectivity of their attitude, which has risen to an elevation far above all striving and effort. Solomon accomplished more, however, in the domain of didactic poetry. His sayings leave everything of the sort which the Hebrew nation previously possessed so far behind, that his wisdom became proverbial, and his adages became a type and pattern for all future times. Yet this most flourishing period of their literature (from which proceeded also the book of Job, a noble didactic poem, indeed the most perfect in respect of both contents and form) did not continue long. Solomon in his old age allowed himself to be seduced from the Lord by the strong allurement of an earthly love for pomp and women (1 Kings xi.); and in like manner the people quickly sank more and more into sensuality, idolatry, and image-worship. This decay of the theocratic life, which threw the powerful and flourishing kingdom into disorder, and after Solomon's death led to the rending of the one people into two hostile, mutually injurious kingdoms, was attended with another consequence—namely, the decay of sacred poetry. And thus, during the subsistence of the separated kingdoms, it was only in times of great religious awakening, when the people for the moment returned to the Lord, as under Jehoshaphat and Hezekiah, that individual singers with renewed force praised God, and sounded out His glorious deeds in Israel; and at a later time, that of the catastrophe in which the Chaldeans were the agents, they expressed in melancholy lamenta-

tions the pain felt by the pious on account of the merited divine judgment (2).

(1) According to 1 Kings v. 12, Solomon spoke three thousand proverbs, and his songs were a thousand and five; of which, however, only the smallest part has been preserved by being taken into the Canon; not so much because the rest were not decidedly valuable, or were of a worldly nature, and so were esteemed unsuitable for preservation by the sound taste of the people (*Hengstb.*), as because they had so much individual character, that they did not profess to edify the Church, or to be of service for divine worship. Compare *Keil* in *Häv.* Einl. iii. p. 12 f. For the wisdom of Solomon, see 1 Kings v. 9–14, x. 1–9; and for its influence on science, poetry, and the habits of composition, see *Ewald's* Gesch. iii. p. 354 ff., where, however, his imaginary "Buch der Ursprünge" is worthless as a proof of the high cultivation of authorship in the age of Solomon.

(2) Compare *Häv.* Einl. iii. p. 14 ff. *Ewald's* opinion (Gesch. iii. p. 479 ff., 653 ff.) deviates from this: it is that the stream of song in the times of the two kingdoms continued as mighty, and its force and freshness as inexhaustible, as under David and Solomon. But he rests it wholly on subjective conjectures, which contradict the true course of history, confirmed as this history is by the titles of the Psalms.

There is an allusion in Amos vi. 5 to a popular profane poetry which imitated the songs of David; and the song of the harlot, Isa. xxiii. 16, presents an interesting fragment of this literature.

As affairs became disordered towards the end of Solomon's reign, and as the true religious life went more and more to decay, *prophecy* rose continually in importance: the prophets are themselves more numerous, and they also appear to have their minds furnished with a larger portion of divine power, so as to lead back the apostate people to their God and salvation. For this purpose they make their announcements no longer in brief utterances, but in extended prophecies, impressive in their subject-matter, and in their form rhetorically finished. In these they apply law and promise to the past, the present, and the future of the theocracy; and they refer to the commandments and judgments, the testimonies and decrees of the Lord, with two objects in view. On the one hand, they throw the light of the law upon the defects, and sins, and sufferings which prevail at every time; and they foretell the judgments which are to

burst, at present and in the future, upon the people and the kingdom, upon the city and the country; so as to lead the godless to repentance, and to preserve the upright from falling away. On the other hand, they unveil the ultimate design of the theocracy, when, after purification by these judgments, days of glory should dawn by the mission of Messiah to redeem Israel from their sins, to be Mediator of a new and everlasting covenant of grace, and to bring the knowledge of the Lord to all nations; so as to open up to the believing people an inexhaustible spring of divine consolation in reference to the severe oppressions which should continue until the dissolution of the old theocracy, and to prepare them through faith and hope for the appearance of Jesus Christ.

The *literature* of these *prophecies*, in which the spiritual life of the theocracy during this period discloses its divine origin and its ripest fruits, begins with the ninth century; and in respect of copiousness and sublimity of ideas, not less than of rhetorical perfection, it attains its climax in Isaiah, during the Assyrian period. Afterwards it loses nothing in respect of importance, although it certainly does lose in oratorical skill. Jeremiah and Ezekiel, just before the exile and in the course of it, exhibit undiminished force of mind and fulness of matter; nay, the visions of Daniel unveil and exhibit the course of the development of the kingdom of God, and its victory over all the kingdoms of the world, with a clearness and expression that are previously unknown (3).

(3) The proof of these general statements will appear in Section ii., Division ii. The false prophets, who were ever opposing the true prophets whom God had sent and enlightened with His Spirit, did not commit to writing any of the prophecies which they invented, and with which they ensnared and seduced the people.

Along with their prophecies, designed not only for the time in which they lived, but also and chiefly for the future, of which the quintessence is comprised and preserved in the prophetical books of the Old Testament, the prophets during this period took unceasing charge of writing history in a theocratic spirit, considering this to be an important task assigned to them by their calling. Prophetic writings appeared in reference to the reigns of most of the kings;

in which (after the way and manner of the historical sections in Isaiah, ch. xxxvi.–xxxix., and in Jeremiah, ch. xl.–xlv.) the narratives of the weightiest occurrences were united with the prophetic utterances which they called forth, in such a way that sometimes the one and sometimes the other predominated (4). Individual prophets also composed separate historical works upon individual reigns, in which the history was undoubtedly represented from a prophetic point of view (5). Besides, the kings had chancellors (מַזְכִּיר, 2 Sam. viii. 16, 1 Kings iv. 3, 2 Kings xviii. 18, 37, 2 Chron. xxxiv. 8, Isa. xxxvi. 3, 22) ["recorder," *English Version*], who recorded their principal undertakings, the most memorable events of their reign for the archives of the state; and who are often considered state-historians, though this is hardly correct. Out of these contemporary records, historical and prophetic, the general "Chronicles of the kingdoms" (6) were subsequently elaborated, probably also by prophets; and the canonical books of Kings and Chronicles are merely brief extracts from these works, confined to matters essential or of chief importance for later ages.

(4) As such there are quoted in Chronicles, דִּבְרֵי, "the words of Samuel the seer," "of Gad the seer" (1 Chron. xxix. 29), "of Nathan the prophet" (1 Chron. xxix. 29; 2 Chron. ix. 29), "of Shemaiah the prophet, and of Iddo the seer" (2 Chron. xii. 15), "of Jehu the son of Hanani" (2 Chron. xx. 34), "of Hosai" (2 Chron. xxxiii. 19 [margin]); נְבוּאָה, "the prophecy of Ahijah the Shilonite;" חָזוֹת, "the vision of Jehdi [Iddo, *Eng. ver.*] the seer" (2 Chron. ix. 29); חָזוֹן, "the vision of Isaiah the prophet" (2 Chron. xxxii. 32). Compare *Kleinert*, Echth. des Jesaj. p. 80 ff.

(5) The prophet Iddo wrote a *Midrash* ["commentary," margin *Eng. ver.*] upon the reign of Abijam (2 Chron. xiii. 22); Isaiah wrote in full the history of Uzziah (2 Chron. xxvi. 22).

(6) The "annuals" [chronicles, *Eng. ver.*] of king David (1 Chron. xxvii. 24), the "book of the acts" of Solomon (1 Kings xi. 41), the book of "the chronicles" of the kings of Judah (1 Kings xiv. 29, xv. 7, 23, xxii. 46; 2 Kings viii. 23, xii. 20, etc.) and of the kings of Israel (1 Kings xiv. 19, xv. 31, xvi. 5, 14, 20, 27, xxii. 39; 2 Kings i. 18, x. 34, etc.), or "book of the kings" of Judah and Israel (2 Chron. xvi. 11, xx. 34, xxv. 26, xxvii. 7, xxviii. 26, xxxii. 32, xxxiii. 18, xxxv. 27, xxxvi. 8). Compare *Keil* on Kings, p. xx., xxiv. f.

§ 8. *Decay and Termination of the Hebrew Literature after the Exile.*

After the return from exile, the spiritual activity of the people was concentrated on the restoration of the temple-worship, and the collection of the more ancient productions of the national mind. *Prophecy*, indeed, raised its voice anew, but only with the following objects in view: 1*st*, and most directly, to rebuke the people on account of their ingratitude for the Lord's grace, and to spur them on to zeal in rebuilding the temple. 2*d*, To give them a pledge of the certain fulfilment of the divine promises, by more thoroughly unveiling Messiah's salvation; and to discover to those who murmured on account of the delay in its dawning, that the hidden cause of this was the unbelief of their sinful hearts, and their estrangement from God. 3*d*, To foretell the severe purifying judgments which still awaited the old theocracy, and to bring to a close the mission of the prophets to Israel, by the announcement of Messiah's forerunner, and of His own appearing for the judgment of all the ungodly.

Poetry also endeavoured to give utterance to the praise of God in numerous temple-songs, which, however, confined themselves to forms which had long been familiar; and it became extinct in a short time, when the last great occasion for singing a new song to the Lord was past and gone, after Nehemiah had fully rebuilt the walls of Jerusalem. Aphoristic poetry made an effort to tread a new path in the philosophizing book of Ecclesiastes [see in Section ii., Division iii., the author's views on this book, and remarks in opposition to them]; but it exhausted all its thoughts in reflections upon the vanity of all earthly possessions and exertions, and it almost sinks to feeble prose in the laborious effort to produce new forms of speech.

Finally, the prophetic spirit entirely disappeared from *history*. In addition to the records in the books of Ezra and Nehemiah of the weightiest events connected with the new colonization of Jerusalem, and the picture in the book of Esther of the deliverance from Haman's murderous assault to which the Jews who remained behind in the interior of the Persian empire were exposed, we have only extracts (important for the priesthood and for matters of worship) from the old state annals, and from various older prophetico-

historical writings, delivered to us in the books of Chronicles by Ezra the scribe.

About B.C. 400 the Hebrew canonical literature came to an end. Anything written later in Hebrew, like Sirach's collection of Proverbs and the history of the Maccabees, is only a feeble imitation of these more ancient canonical models, and remains far inferior to them. With Malachi the spirit of the ancient prophets passed away from Israel (1 Macc. iv. 46, ix. 27, xiv. 41). Consequently, not even the political exaltation of the better part of the nation under the Maccabees could restore life to their literature, and enable it to throw out new shoots: the utmost which the spiritual life of this time could do, was to extract nourishment and edification from the ancient writings which had been penetrated by the breath of the Spirit of God (1).

(1) *Hitzig*, *C. v. Lengerke*, and others, maintain very confidently that psalmody soared aloft once more in the Maccabean age. There is no historical foundation whatever for this assertion, either in the spiritual character of that period or in our Psalter. Compare *Keil* in *Häv.* Einl. iii. p. 17 ff.

CHAPTER II.

THE LANGUAGES OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

§ 9. *Name and Origin.*

Ernest Renan, histoire générale et système comparé des langues Sémitiques. Première partie, Paris 1855 [3d ed. 1863].

All the books of the Old Testament are written in *Hebrew*, except some portions of Daniel and Ezra in *Chaldee* (1). The Hebrew language takes its name from Abraham's descendants, the Israelites, who are ethnographically called *Hebrews* (2), and who spoke this language while they were an independent people. In the Old Testament it is poetically called *the language of Canaan*, and also *the Jews' language*, from the kingdom of Judah (3). It was very nearly akin to that of the Canaanites, the more ancient inhabitants of Palestine; yet it was not borrowed from the Canaanites,

but entered the country with Abraham, and was cultivated there by his descendants (4).

(1) The Chaldee parts are: Dan. ii. 4–vii. 28; Ezra iv. 8–vi. 18, vii. 12–26; also Jer. x. 11. The oldest trace of the Chaldee is in Gen. xxxi. 47.

(2) The patronymic and theocratic name of this people was *Israel* (after Gen. xxxii. 29, xxxv. 10), Ex. iii. 16, 18, or *children of Israel*, Ex. i. 9, 12, 13, and so on through the rest of the Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges, and Samuel, until the majority of the tribes in David's time (2 Sam. ii. 9, 10, 17, 28), and after Solomon's death the ten tribes who fell away from the house of David, assumed the name of *Israel* in opposition to the tribe and kingdom of *Judah*. Yet the prophets frequently use the name of Israel for the entire people, by whom it was again used after the exile until the times of the Maccabees: so that the name *Jews* for the entire people first becomes customary by means of the Idumean princes, and *Israelites* is preserved alongside of it only as a name of honour for the ancient covenant people; for instance, Rom. ix. 4, 2 Cor. xi. 22. Compare *Winer*, bibl. Real-Wörterbuch, article Israel.

The name *Hebrews* is used partly by foreigners (Gen. xxxix. 14, xli. 12; Ex. i. 16; 1 Sam. iv. 6, 9, xiii. 19, xxix. 3), partly by the Israelites themselves, but only in intercourse with strangers (Gen. xl. 15; Ex. ii. 7, iii. 18; Jonah i. 9, etc.), or in opposition to other nations (Gen. xliii. 32; Ex. i. 15, xxi. 2; Deut. xv. 12; 1 Sam. xiii. 3, 7, xiv. 21; Jer. xxxiv. 9, 14). Compare *Gesenius*, Gesch. d. hebr. Sprache, p. 9 f.; *Winer*, *ibid.*, art. Hebräer. There is a controversy as to the origin of this name (comp. *Carpzov*, crit. sacr. p. 165 sqq. 2d ed.; *Winer*, *ibid.*). *Aben Ezra*, *Buxtorf*, *Löscher*, *Buddeus*, *Carpzov*, and recently *Ewald*, *v. Lengerke*, *E. Meier*, and others, derive it from the Shemite *Eber* (Gen. x. 24, xi. 14 ff.); whereupon *Ewald* (Gesch. i. p. 382) even brings it into combination with the Iberians (*Strabo*, xi. 3) and the Arabs (as does *Wahl*, Gesch. d. morgenl. Sprachen, p. 453 f.). On the contrary, the most of the Rabbins and of the Fathers, *Luther*, *Walton*, *Clericus*, *Gussetius*, and others, *Gesenius*, *Hengstb.* (Balaam, p. 206 ff.), derive it from עֵבֶר, "beyond," following the Sept., which translates עִבְרִי, Gen. xiv. 13, ὁ περάτης, "the man from beyond," referring to Abraham's immigration. [*Bleek* is also thoroughly of this opinion, p. 72.] The first occurrence of the name in the mouth of the fugitive, in Gen. xiv. 13, is decisive in favour of this view, whereas *Eber* (Gen. x. 24, xi. 15) is nowhere elevated to the rank of father of the race of Israel; and "the children of Eber," Gen. x. 21,

and "Eber," Num. xxiv. 24, denote the people *beyond* the Euphrates. Comp. especially *Walton*, Proleg. Bibl. Polygl. iii. 1, and *Hengstb. ibid.*

(3) "The language of Canaan," Isa. xix. 18; "Jewish," 2 Kings xviii. 26, Isa. xxxvi. 11, 13, Neh. xiii. 24. The name "Hebrew language" nowhere occurs in the Old Testament, since in general there is rarely anything said of the language of the Israelites: it appears in the prologue to Ecclus., ἑβραϊστί, and in *Josephus*, Antiq. i. 1, 2, γλῶττα τῶν Ἑβραίων. In the New Testament, ἑβραϊστί, John v. 2, xix. 13, 17, etc., and ἑβραὶς διάλεκτος, Acts xxi. 40, xxii. 2, xxvi. 14, denote the *Aramaic*, which was spoken in the country at the time. In the Targums, and by the Rabbins, Hebrew is called לְשׁוֹן הַקּוֹדֶשׁ ["the sacred language"], as the language of Holy Scripture; for instance, in the Targ. of Jonathan and of Jerusalem at Gen. xi. 1.

(4) Comp. *Bochart*, Canaan, l. ii. c. i.; *Gesenii*, Scripturæ linguæque Phœnic. monumm. iii. Partes, Lips. 1837, 4to, P. i. p. 329 sqq.; *Ewald*, Gesch. d. Volkes Israel, i. p. 495, and bibl. Jahrb. i. p. 202; *Häv.* Einl. i. 1, p. 119 ff. [*Bleek* takes a somewhat different view: see below, addition to § 11, Note 11.]

Hebrew and Chaldee are two shoots from one great linguistic stem, which was indigenous not in Canaan (Phœnicia and Palestine) alone, but also in Assyria and Aram (Syria, Mesopotamia, and Babylonia), and in Arabia, and which also spread very early over a part of Asia Minor (5), Ethiopia, and the Punic north coast of Africa. It was divided into three branches—the *Aramaic* languages in the north-east, the *Arabic* in the south, and the *Hebrew* in the middle, between them. We are accustomed to bestow upon them the common name, the *Shemitic* languages (6).

(5) Comp. *Lasseh* in the deutsch-morgenl. Zeitschrift, x. 3, p. 364 ff.

(6) The name *oriental languages*, in use among the Fathers, particularly *Jerome*, and among the older theologians, has been almost entirely supplanted by this of *Shemitic*, proposed by *Schlözer* (Repert. f. bibl. u. morgenl. Litter. viii. 161 [in the year 1781, according to *Bleek*, p. 39]) and *Eichhorn* (allg. Biblioth. vi. 772 ff., Gesch. der neuern Sprachk. i. 403 ff.). Yet the name does not seem wholly suitable: since, on the one hand, these languages were not spoken by all the descendants of Shem named in Gen. x., for instance not by the Elamites [nor perhaps by Assur and Lud, says *Bleek*, *ibid.*]; and, on the other hand, they were spoken by Canaan and Cush, who sprang

from Ham. Comp. *Stange*, theol. Symmikta, i. 1; *Gesenius*, Gesch. p. 5; *Renan*, loc. cit. p. 25 sqq. [*Bleek*, *ibid.*, observes that *Hupfeld*, hebr. Gramm. p. 2, has proposed the name *Vorderasiatische*, languages of Hither Asia, but that his proposal has not been adopted, as indeed it is too wide.]

§ 10. *General Character of the Shemitic Languages.*

All the Shemitic languages are distinguished from the Indo-Germanic or Japhetic by their peculiar law of formation, that the consonants shall be the solid body of the words, and that the vowels shall be the soul which moves them; and also that the fundamental signification shall lie almost exclusively in the consonants, not (as with the other class of languages) in the combination of one or more consonants with a vowel belonging to the root. Consequently the Indo-Germanic languages attain their opulence of vocables by means of the *logical* law which compounds roots that are verbs and particles; whereas the Shemitic languages are enriched in a *phonetic* manner by the multiplication of sounds,—it may be by discriminating the consonantal sounds more nicely, or by doubling the consonants in the roots, or by attaching new consonants to the monosyllabic stem (biliteral roots transformed by a further process into triliterals, quadriliterals, and quinqueliterals); but they are utterly ignorant of the combination or fusion of primitive verbs and particles into roots of words, and they can show only isolated instances of the fusion of two verbal or nominal stems into compound verbs or nouns (1).

This phonetic law of the Shemitic languages also governs the *formation of words* from roots so absolutely, that the manifold modifications of verbs and nouns take place most readily and often by a change of vowels within the limits of a single firm sound; and it is only where this is insufficient that the object is attained by prefixes and suffixes. On the contrary, in the Indo-Germanic languages the words are formed almost exclusively by suffixes; and the vowel in the root can change only within its own circle of related sounds, according to certain rules of euphony.

Then, as to the production of *grammatical forms*, the Shemitic languages have no neuter, but only two genders, which, however [with a copiousness of forms that is strange to our languages], are

distinguished in the second and third persons of the verb. In the inflection of verbs they have only two moods [commonly considered to be tenses]; but these are strongly contrasted by the position of the marks of the persons at the end or at the beginning,—the so-called *Perfect* for the completed or actual, and the *Imperfect* for the incomplete or hypothetical, without decidedly giving expression to the tenses by peculiar forms. Nouns are not declined by means of case-endings, [though there are traces of this in certain archaic forms]; but the genitive is expressed by closely combining two words, and other cases by using prepositions, while the pronouns have mere suffixes for the oblique cases. Finally, they are characterized by poverty in the particles, and consequently they have their clauses formed with extreme simplicity; and they are defective in the structure of sentences, [at least if they are judged by the standard of the Latin and the German languages].

(1) Valuable hints as to the original course of formation of these languages are offered by *Hupfeld*, de emendenda ratione lexicographiæ Semiticæ comment., Marpurgi 1827, 4to; by *Fr. Delitzsch*, Jesurun, Isagoge in Grammat. et Lexicographiam ling. Hebr., Grimma 1838; and by *Ewald*, ausf. Lehrbuch d. hebr. Sprache, 6th ed. §§ 4–6, 107, etc.

§ 11. *The Aramaic Language.*

The Aramaic language, which prevailed to the north-east of Palestine—that is, in Assyria, Mesopotamia, Babylon, and Syria—in conformity with the rougher climate of these countries, is rough and flat in its consonants, poor and dull in its vowels, and is the least cultivated of all the Shemitic family (1). As yet we have made closer acquaintance with only two dialects of it, the Chaldee and the Syriac (2). Its literature is as ancient as that of the Hebrew, but it first becomes known to us in the times of the Babylonian exile (3).

(1) Comp. *Gesenius*, Gesch. § 16; *Häv.* Einl. i. 1, § 19 ff. 2d ed.; *Jul. Fürst*, Lehrgeb. der Aram. Idiome, pp. 2 ff., 19 ff. Instead of the feebler hissing sounds in Hebrew, the Aramaic has often the hard D and T sounds; it is poor in vowels, and in its system of conjugations.

(2) See *J. A. M. Nagel*, de lingua Aramæa, Altorf 1739, 4to; *Gesenius*, Gesch. p. 6; *A. Th. Hoffmann*, Grammat. Syr. p. 3.

(3) It is wrong in *J. Fürst*, *ibid.*, to infer from its greater roughness and want of cultivation, that the Aramaic is older than the other Shemitic languages. [This is also the criticism of *Bleek*, p. 76.]

As the Chaldee (4) is known to us only from Jewish monuments (5), some have denied to it the character of an independent dialect, and have pronounced it a degenerate shoot from the Aramaic or Syrian branch of languages, the degeneracy being due to an intermixture of Hebrew. Nevertheless the Chaldee differs so frequently from the Syriac, both in the province of the grammar and in that of the lexicon (6), that we must consider it to be the eastern Aramaic, which was spoken in Babylon (7).

(4) The name *Chaldee language* is derived from Dan. i. 4 and ii. 26 (Sept.), and was introduced by *Jerome;* comp. *Carpzov*, crit. sac. p. 275 sqq. In the Old Testament it is called אֲרָמִית, 2 Kings xviii. 26, Isa. xxxvi. 11, Dan. ii. 4, Ezra iv. 7. [*Bleek*, pp. 45–48, discusses the question whether, besides the Shemitic language prevailing in Babylonia under Nebuchadnezzar, there was another, probably Medo-Persian, according to the view of *Michaelis*, *Bertholdt*, *Hartmann*, *Lorsbach*, *Gesenius*, and *Winer*, who think that this is meant in Dan. i. 4; and so also *Hengstb.* Beiträge, i. p. 310. Yet he scarcely thinks them correct; for Dan. ii. 4 represents the Chaldeans as speaking Aramaic at court; neither is there any historical indication of two different languages. The principal reason in favour of their opinion seems to him to be this, that the names of persons and of gods are not Shemitic; but these may have been retained from the period of the Assyrian dominion, as *Rosenmüller* says, Bibl. Alterthsk. i. 2, p. 32 f. The Assyrian language itself, he says, was Shemitic, according to the earlier view, and so also *Eichhorn*, *Heeren*, *Adelung*, *Häv.*, etc., think; but *Jablonski*, *Lorsbach*, *Gesenius*, *Winer*, etc., consider it to be Medo-Persian,—an opinion strongly supported by their proper names, and which *Hartmann* would confirm from Isa. xxxiii. 19. The discussion has increased of late, owing to the Assyrian cuneiform inscriptions, the language of which is generally held to be decidedly Shemitic, like that of those at Babylon; yet *Bleek* himself reckons the whole to be still very uncertain, and in particular says the vowel-writing is not like Shemitic. His editor, *Kamphausen*, however, notices that he fails to make a distinction among the three kinds of

inscription which probably occur—one Aryan, one Tartar, and one Shemitic.]

(5) The Chaldee sections in Daniel and Ezra (comp. § 9, Note 1), the Targums, and the few remains of the current speech of the country in Palestine at the time of Jesus, which is called *Hebrew* in the New Testament, but in the Talmud *Syriac* or *Aramaic*, which was scarcely distinguishable from the language of the Chaldee paraphrases; on the contrary, that of the Talmud should be called *new Hebrew*. Comp. *Renan*, p. 207 sqq.

(6) See the opinion of the older theologians in *Carpzov*, crit. sac. p. 276 sqq.; and *Hoffmann*, gramm. Syr. p. 4 sqq. The difference between Chaldee and Syriac was reduced to little more than variety of pronunciation and spelling by *J. D. Michaelis* (Abhandlung v. d. syr. Sprache, p. 4 ff.); and in recent times, *Hupfeld* (theol. Stud. u. Krit. 1830, ii. p. 291 ff.), *De Wette* [from his fourth edition onwards, says *Bleek*, p. 53, who himself does not agree with him] (Einl. p. 49), and *J. Fürst*, *ibid.*, p. 5 ff., have followed him, and denied the difference of these dialects. On the contrary, *Hoffmann* and *Winer*, ll. cc., *Häv.* p. 115 ff., and particularly *Fr. Dietrich*, "de sermonis chald. proprietate," Lipsiæ 1829 [*Bleek*, p. 53, says 1838; and adds, *Wichelhaus*, "de Novi Test. versione Syriaca Peschito," Halle 1850, pp. 36–50], have exhibited their differences with greater precision, and have proved the independent character of the Chaldee. [See the important paper of Professor *John Macgill* on the Chaldee of Daniel and Ezra, in the Journal of Sacred Literature, Jan. 1861, pp. 273–391, largely quoted in *Pusey* on Daniel, p. 44 ff.]

(7) The principal helps for learning Chaldee are: *A.* The Lexicons of *Joh. Buxtorf*, Lex. Chald. Talm. Rabb., Basileæ 1640, fol.; *Dessauer*, aram. chald. deutsch. Handwörterbuch, Erlangen 1838. *B.* The Grammars of *Joh. Buxtorf* (Basileæ 1615, ed. emendatiss. 1685); *J. Dav. Michaelis* (Göttingen 1771); *Winer*, Gramm. des bibl. und targum. Chaldaismus (2d ed. Leipzig 1842 [translated, with Chaldee Chrestomathy, by the Rev. *Elias Rigg*, D.D., New York 1858]); *Jul. Fürst*, Lehrgeb. der aram. Idiome, Th. i. chald. Gramm. (Leipzig 1835); and others given in *Winer*, *ibid.* p. 11 f.

Of the western Aramaic dialects, we have a tolerably intimate acquaintance only with the Syriac, in which there flourished a considerable literature from the middle of the second century [of the Christian era] and onwards. Commencing with the translation of the Holy Scriptures, and becoming further developed in the theo-

logical schools at Edessa and Nisibis, it did not remain confined to the sphere of the Church and theology, but gradually extended to objects of natural history and medicine, of general history and of grammar. However, it exhibits the Aramaic no longer in its purity, but pretty thoroughly pervaded by Greek elements (8). This Syriac is still the ecclesiastical language of the Maronites [*Bleek*, pp. 55–6, says, at least for celebrating mass; whereas in the towns first, and afterwards in the country, it has been ever more and more supplanted by the Arabic since the tenth century], who spread the knowledge of it throughout Europe in the sixteenth century; also of the Nestorians, Jacobites, and Chaldean Christians; and in a corrupted vulgar dialect it is spoken as their mother tongue to this day by the Syrian Christians in Kurdistan and Mesopotamia, and also in the neighbourhood of Damascus (9).

(8) Of the Syriac literature only a small portion has been published. The principal work upon the subject is *Joseph. Assemanni*, bibliotheca orient., 3 vols. bound in 4, Romæ 1719–28, fol., which makes known to us the treasures of the Vatican. Historical surveys of it are given by *Anton. Gottl. Hoffmann* in *Bertholdt's* krit. Journ. d. neust. theol. Litt., xiv. p. 225 ff. (incomplete), and in the prolegg. to his Syriac grammar, and in *Häv.* Einl. i. 1, § 22. Comp. also [Cardinal] Wiseman's horæ Syriacæ, t. i., Romæ 1828; and upon the Syriac manuscripts lately acquired by the British Museum, in the Allg. Lit. Zeitung 1846, Sept., Nos. 203–205; and Renan, p. 240 sqq. [Also the late *Canon Cureton's* various works, the last of which was published posthumously—Ancient Syrian Documents, London 1864.]

The principal helps for learning Syriac are: *A.* The lexicons of *Schaaf*, Lugd. Batav. 1708 (only for the New Testament); *Edm. Castel*, ed. *J. Dav. Michaelis* (Gottingæ 1788), [2 vols. 4to, says *Bleek*, p. 57; originally this lexicon was prepared to accompany the London Polyglott]; and *G. H. Bernstein*, Lex. ling. Syr., vol. i., Berolini 1857, fol. [Of this work *Bleek*, *ibid.*, says there was a pressing necessity for such a dictionary, and that materials were not awanting, especially in the dictionaries of Isa Bar Ali and Abulhassan Bar Bahlul, of the ninth and tenth centuries respectively.] *B.* The grammars of *Chr. Ben. Michaelis* (Syriasmus, Halæ 1741), *J. D. Michaelis* (Halle 1784), and *Hoffmann*, grammaticæ Syr. libri iii., Halæ 1827, 4to, in which, p. 41 ff., the literature may be

found more fully noticed. [Also *Uhlemann's*, Berlin 1829, 2d ed. 1857; translated into English. *B. H. Cowper*, Syriac Grammar, London 1858.]

(9) Comp. *Em. Rödiger* on the vulgar Aramaic of the present Syrian Christians, in Zeitschrift f. d. Kunde des Morgenl., ii. pp. 77 ff., 314 ff.; and *Gumprecht*, Zeitschrift f. allg. Erdkunde, 1853, i. pt. iii. p. 141 ff.

To the Aramaic branches of the Shemitic language belong, besides, the *Palmyrene* dialect (10); the old *Phœnician*, together with the *Punic* (11); the *Samaritan* (12); and the *mixed dialect of the Christians of St. John*, or the *Zabians* (13).

(10) Remains in the Palmyrene inscriptions, as to which comp. *Hartmann* in *Ol. G. Tychsen*, ii. 2, p. 254 ff.; *Hoffmann*, gramm. Syr. p. 13; *Gesenius*, Monum. Phœn. i. p. 80 sqq.; *Häv.* Einl. i. 1, p. 118. [*Bleek*, p. 59, says we have these chiefly from *Robert Wood's* Ruins of Palmyra, London 1753, interpreted independently by *Barthélemy* in Paris, and better by *Swinton* in Oxford; then more are given by *J. G. Eichhorn*, Marmora Palmyrena explicata, Göttingen 1827, 4to. They are chiefly bilingual, in an Aramaic which is much like the common dialect, and in Greek; the earliest being A.D. 49, but most of them being of the second and third centuries.]

(11) A document of some size in the old Phœnician was first discovered in 1855; it is a long inscription on the sarcophagus of the Sidonian king Eshmunazar [communicated first by the well-known American missionary in Beyrout, Dr. *Thomson*, and purchased by the Duc de Luynes for the Louvre, says *Bleek*, p. 65], which *Rödiger*, *Dietrich*, *Hitzig*, *Schlottmann*, *De Luynes*, *Ewald* (as to which compare deutsch-morgenl. Zeitschrift, x. 761), and Dr. *Munk* in the Journ. Asiat. i. p. 273 sqq., have endeavoured to interpret. More recent is the sacrificial tablet discovered at Marseilles, explained by *Movers* (Phöniz. Texte, ii., Breslau 1847); *Ewald*, bibl. Jahrb. i. 187 ff.; and *A. C. Judas*, nouv. analyse de l'inscript. phénic. de Marseille, Paris 1857, fol. Of chief importance for the Punic are the Punic passages in the Pœnulus of Plautus, illustrated by *Movers* (Phöniz. Texte, i. 1845); and *Ewald* in *Lassen's* Zeitschrift, iv., vi., and vii. The rest of the Phœnician and Punic inscriptions (including those on coins) hitherto discovered have been collected and illustrated by *Gesenius* in Monum. ling. Phœn. [3 vols. 4to, Lips. 1837; to which *Bleek*, p. 64, adds 45 inscriptions by the *Abbé Bourgade*, Paris 1852, fol., deci-

phered by the Abbé Bargès]; *A. C. Judas*, étude demonstrat. de la langue phénic., Paris 1847, and Nouv. études sur une serie d'inscriptions Numido-puniques," *ibid.* 1857, 4to. Besides, comp. *Movers* in *Ersch und Gruber*, allg. Encyclop., sect. iii. vol. xxiv. p. 423 ff.; and *Renan*, *l.c.*, p. 171 sqq. [*Bleek*, pp. 60–62, says he agrees with most moderns, against *Pareau* (Institut. interpretis Vet. Testamenti, Ultrajecti 1822, p. 25), *Häv.*, and *Keil*, in believing that Abraham spoke Aramaic in Syria, as Laban did (Gen. xxxi. 47), and learned in Canaan the language of the Canaanites, which Jacob spoke on occasion of that treaty with Laban; and this language of Canaan, as we infer from what remains of it in proper names, is just what we call Hebrew: at which conclusion *Clericus* arrived with substantial correctness in his first dissertation prefixed to the commentary on Genesis. Further, this is to all appearance substantially the language of the Phœnicians, who called themselves Canaanites, and are reckoned so in the Bible (Gen. x. 15; Obad. 20; Matt. xv. 22). In support of this opinion he appeals to the authority of *Augustine* and *Jerome*; and also to the fourfold evidence of proper names, of the fragments in Plautus, of coins, and of seals, etc. Again, at pp. 65–67, he says that *H. A. Humalker*, in his Miscellanea Phœnicia, went wrong in asserting that the Phœnician was as nearly allied to other Shemitic dialects as to Hebrew; yet *Gesenius* also went too far when he identified it with Hebrew. There might be differences of language throughout the extent of Phœnicia, and differences in the development of the *usus loquendi*, etc., gradually separating it more and more from the Hebrew with which it had been once identical, and this might be the case especially in the Phœnician colonies; but he gives many examples of its agreement with the Hebrew where this latter dialect differs from the Aramaic, whereas the reverse is rare. And in pp. 72, 73, he notices that *the language of Ashdod* is distinguished from Hebrew (Neh. xiii. 24); yet he thinks that it was not precisely another language, but rather a less pure pronunciation: in conformity with which opinion, at p. 93, he calls it "perhaps simply a coarser pronunciation." At pp. 70, 71, he gives the names of Phœnician authors, the principal one being *Sanchoniathon*, of whose historical writings fragments have been preserved in the Greek translation of *Philo Byblius*: but he suspects that the translation must have been very loose and untrustworthy, if not a mere forgery, which was the opinion of *Movers*; whereas Bleek's editor, *Kamphausen*, appears to pay greater respect to them, in deference to the favour for them shown by *Ewald* and *Bunsen*.]

(12) The Samaritan occupies an intermediate position with re-

ference to Hebrew and Aramaic, and is particularly characterized by changes in the gutturals; also by containing many non-Shemitic (Cuthaic) words. Regarding it, see *Fr. Uhlemann*, Institutiones linguæ Samarit., Lipsiæ 1837; *Renan*, p. 217 sqq. [In addition, *Bleek*, p. 58, names *Joh. Morinus*, Opuscula Hebræo-Samar., 1657, 12mo, which includes a dictionary; and *Christoph. Cellarius*, Horæ Samar., Cizæ 1682, Jenæ 1703, which includes grammar, chrestomathy, and dictionary. And he refers to *Gesenius*, Anecdota orientalia, fascic. i., carmina Samaritana continens, Lipsiæ 1825.]

(13) The Zabian language, known as yet only from the Codex Nasaræus [also named, The Book of Adam], edited (with a Lexidion and Onomasticon) by *Matth. Norberg*, 3 vols., Göttingen 1815–17 [*Bleek*, p. 59, says with a Latin translation, Lund 1815–16, 3 vols. 4to, and the Lexid. and Onom. 1816–17, 4to], occupies a place between the Syrian and the Chaldee, makes frequent changes in gutturals and other letters, is in general incorrect in spelling and grammar, and has adopted many Persian words. [*Bleek*, p. 59, adds that the shapes of the letters of the alphabet resemble most those of the Nestorian Syrians, though the printed copy is in the common type.] See *Lorsbach*, in *Stäudlin's* Beiträge z. Philos. u. Gesch. d. Relig., v. 1 ff.; and Museum f. bibl. und orient. Litt., by *Arnoldi*, *Lorsbach*, and *Hartmann*, vol. i. Stuck 1; *Gesenius* in the Jena Allg. Lit. Zeitung, 1817, Nn. 48 fl., and art. *Zabier* in the specimen part of *Ersch and Gruber's* allg. Encycl.; *Renan*, p. 224 sqq. [On some of the subjects noticed here, *Kamphausen*, *Bleek's* editor, p. 49, says much may be expected from the discoveries of *Chwolsohn*, whose first work is entitled, Die Ssabier u. der Ssabismus, Petersburg 1856.]

§ 12. *The Arabic Language.*

The most cultivated and opulent of all the Shemitic languages is the *Arabic*, which is more opulent than the Hebrew in consonants and vowels, in roots of words, and in grammatical forms (1). Before the time of Mohammed it was confined to Arabia, and scarcely cultivated, except in poetry; but along with Islam, it has spread itself over the greater part of Asia and Africa, and has unfolded its great wealth in a very comprehensive literature, which extends to almost all the domains of knowledge (2).

There is a want of monumental and other information as to its oldest form and appearance (comp. אֶלְמוֹדָד, Gen. x. 26). [*Bleek*, p. 41, notices the reputation of the Arabs for wisdom, especially proverbial

wisdom, in 1 Kings v. 10, x. 1 ff.] In the beginning it probably had forms which were simpler and more like the Hebrew than those in which it is known to us, which have been cultivated to the very uttermost; but soon the one language fell to pieces, as the many independent tribes formed their several dialects (3), of which the *Himyarite* in Yemen was strongly marked by differences from the language of central Arabia, being simpler, and so more nearly allied to the Hebrew (4). But when the Himyarite kingdom fell, this dialect was compelled to yield to that of Mecca, the *Modarensite* or *Koraishite*, which had become a written form of speech before Mohammed's time, and is already in the Koran (Sur. xvi. 103) named *the Arabic language*, and commended universally. It is in this dialect that the entire Arabic literature is composed, whose most flourishing period extends to the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Then it was gradually supplanted by the present commonly-spoken language, which has not only adopted many foreign words, Turkish especially, but has also lost the variety of forms which it possessed, and the very capacity for forming others, and thus has returned nearer to the ancient simplicity, as well as to the Hebrew and Aramaic (5).

(1) Comp. *Gesenius*, Gesch. d. hebr. Sprache, p. 57, and art. Arab. Sprache in *Ersch and Gruber*, sect. i. vol. v.; *Ewald*, gramm. crit. ling. Arab. Prolegg.; *Häv.* Einl. i. § 23 f.; *Renan*, p. 320 sqq. [*Bleek*, pp. 40, 42, says the Arabic has about 60,000 words and 6000 roots, and the Hebrew only about 6000 and 2000 respectively; yet that we are to remember how much larger is the Arabic literature in our possession, and how much later its development as a living language continued.]

(2) See *Haji Khalfae*, lexicon bibliogr. et encyclop. ed., Lat. vert., et comment. instr. *G. Flügel*, Lipsiæ 1835–52, 6 vols. 4to. The larger part of the Arabic literature is still unprinted. A list of the printed works is given in *Schnurrer*, biblioth. Arab., Halæ 1811, and in *Zenker*, biblioth. orient., Lipsiæ 1846, fascic. i.

(3) Comp. *Ewald*, *l.c.*, p. 4 sq.; *Renan*, p. 289 sq.

(4) *Gesenius*, üb. Himjarit. Schrift. u. Sprache in Allg. Lit. Zeitung 1841, Nr. 123 ff.; and *E. Rödiger*, Excurs üb Himjar. Inschriften, in *Wellsted's* Reise in Arabien, ii. 352 ff.; *Renan*, p. 296 sqq.; and *Osiander*, deutsch morgenl. Zeitschrift, x. p. 29 ff.

(5) Comp. *Silv. de Sacy* in the Mémoires de l'Acad. roy. des in-

script. T. L. p. 349 sqq.; *Gesenius*, art. Arab. Sprache und Litteratur, *ibid.*; *Häv.* i. 1, p. 136 ff. The best helps for learning Arabic are: *A.* The Lexicons of *Jac. Golius* (Leyden 1653, fol.), and *Freytag*, 4 vols. (Halle 1830-37), 4to; [besides the native dictionaries of *Dscheuhari*, died in 1107, containing 40,000 words; of *Firusabadi*, died in 1414, the original one "al Lame," or "the enlightener," in sixty volumes, abridged by himself, and named "al Kamus," or "the ocean," printed at Calcutta 1817, 2 vols. fol., containing 60,000 words. —*Bleek*, p. 44]. *B.* The grammars of *Thomas Erpenius*, edited by *A. Schultens* (2d ed. Lugd. Batavorum 1770), *S. de Sacy* (2d ed. Paris 1829), *E. F. C. Rosenmüller* (Institutt., Leipzig 1818), *G. Henr. Aug. Ewald* (gr. critica, 2 vols. Leipzig 1831–33), *C. P. Caspari* (Leipzig 1848), *Charl. Schier* (Leipzig 1849); [*T. Roorda*, Grammatica, Chrestomathia, cum Lexico, Leovardiæ 1858; *William Wright*, 2 vols. London 1859, 1862.]

For the vulgar Arabic: *Fr. de Dombay*, gramm. linguæ Mauro-arab., Vindob. 1800; *Caussin de Perceval*, gr. Arabe vulgaire, Paris 1833.

From the Himyarite dialect of Yemen there issued the *Ethiopic* or *Geez*, simpler in its character than the Arabic, and thus coming nearer to the Hebrew and Aramaic. It is known to us through a translation of the Bible, and by other ecclesiastical writings. It was the living national language of Abyssinia, till it was supplanted by the present vulgar tongue, the *Amharic* dialect, from the thirteenth century onwards. [*Bleek*, p. 45, says the fourteenth; and adds that this dialect, which is also Shemitic, is little used for writing.] (6)

(6) *Gesenius*, art. Æthiop. Sprache u. Litterat., in *Ersch and Gruber*, sect. i. vol. ii., and Amhar. Sprache, *ibid.* vol. iii.; *Renan*, p. 304 sqq.; and *A. Dillmann*, Gramm. der äthiop. Sprache, Leipzig 1857, p. 1 ff. The only helps for learning it, besides *Dillmann's* grammar, are *Hiob Ludolf*, lexic. æthiop. [1661; *Bleek*, p. 45], 2d ed., Frankfurt a. Main 1699, fol.; lexic. Amharicum, *ibid.* 1698, fol.; and his grammat. Æthiop. [1661, 4to, *Bleek*], 2d ed. 1702, fol.

§ 13. *The Hebrew Language, its Age and Character.*

Although Hebrew is the Shemitic language which possesses the oldest literature, yet even in its oldest documents it meets us in a form which has been brought to such thorough perfection, that its original

constitution is withdrawn from the light of history. The majority of its roots have been already accommodated to the law of having three letters; and the grammatical formations, as well as those of derivative words, are already so fixed down, with a few exceptional traces of a different state of matters, that in later times they undergo only trifling changes (1).

(1) The most of the Rabbins, the Fathers, and the older theologians; *John Buxtorf*, the son, dissertatt. phil. theoll., Basileæ 1662, Diss. i.; *Br. Walton*, Prolegg. iii. 3 sqq.; *Aug. Pfeiffer*, decas select. exercitatt. bibl., in his Dubia vexata, p. 59 sqq.; *Steph. Morinus*, de ling. primæva, Ultrajecti 1694; *Val. Löscher*, de causis ling. Hebr. i. c. 2, 3; *Carpzov*, crit. sacr. p. 174 sqq.; and others,—as *A. C. Bode*, *Hezel*, *Anton* (comp. *Gesenius*, Geschichte, p. 13), *Mich. Baumgarten*, bibl. Comment. i. p. 155; *Scholz*, Einl. i. § 9 ff.,—believe that Hebrew was the primitive language of mankind. This opinion is completely untenable. Comp. *Häv.* Einl. i. § 26, 2d ed. [*Bleek*, pp. 73–4, names among the Rabbins and Fathers the *Targums of Jonathan and of Jerusalem* on Gen. xi. 1; *Augustin*, Civ. Dei, xvi. 11; *Jerome* ad Damasum 142, etc.; whereas *Theodoret*, Quæst. in Genesin 60, gives this honour to Syriac, holding that Hebrew was first introduced by God through Moses as a holy language. *Bleek* himself, while entirely denying that Hebrew was the primitive language, says the question is of no theological interest, since it is plain that Abraham's family learned the Hebrew from the Canaanites. He believes in the unity of the human race, and therefore in some one primeval language; which, however, was certainly very imperfect, and so fell aside as those more perfect languages appeared of which it had the roots and germs. And he would take the account in Gen. xi. 1 rather symbolically than literally, of a unity of purpose rather than of language, and not of a magical working of the power of God to make almost all men forget their old language, and receive a new one. There is, however, a simpler and safer way of understanding that account, without any kind of "magical" working. There are processes continually in operation which produce infinitesimal changes in all living languages. At a particular crisis in the history of the human race, God put forth His power to accelerate these miraculously, and to effect in a day what might have been the natural result after many ages. Again, pp. 75–77, *Bleek* says, none of the three present branches, Aramaic, Hebrew, and Arabic, can have been the primitive Shemitic, for neither the forms nor the roots can be all traced to any one of them; yet Hebrew may approach nearest to it: and this he

thinks natural, considering how the Hebrew literature is much the most ancient. If we inquire as to the most ancient language in the world, probably the Shemitic may have sprung up at the same time with other branches; but it is the oldest which we have remaining, and therefore it is likely to be nearest the original. He places no dependence on the argument from the proper names in the beginning of Genesis, because they may have been translated or transformed according to the genius of the Hebrew, and also because it is difficult to attach natural significations to these names from Cain or Cainan on to Lamech.] Deeper researches into the Shemitic languages point back to a primitive common Shemitic tongue, whose roots were for the most part monosyllabic,—a case precisely the same as that of the widely-branched Indo-Germanic languages. These two primitive languages, or stems of languages, evince so close a relationship in roots and fundamental notions (so far as we can infer their original form from the historical languages which have proceeded from them), that we venture to take for granted that originally they were one (comp. *Ewald*, ausf. Lehrbuch, p. 24 f.); and in their unity we find an evident trace of the original unity of *all* languages. Yet alongside of this, the pervading differences in the laws of formation for these two linguistic stems point to an inexplicable—that is, a miraculous—division or confusion of that principle of formation which was originally one; a fact as unfathomable by scientific investigation as the original constitution of that primitive language which lies beyond the limits of all linguistic inquiries.

In relation to the rest of the Shemitic languages, the Hebrew has for the most part retained the stamp of high antiquity, originality, and greater simplicity and purity of forms: only in individual cases of these has it lost its character of antiquity (2). In respect of copiousness of diction and wealth of grammatical forms, it occupies a middle place, corresponding to the geographical position of the Hebrews — between the poverty and want of development of the Aramaic, and the wealth and cultivation of the Arabic. In particular, it has unfolded a rich store of notions in the sphere of religion, and generally in everything which stirred the life and spirit of the people (3); and it has admitted words from foreign languages only in the case of foreign objects (4). It has also developed early a peculiar poetical style alongside of that for prose composition and that for the language of common life (5); whereas, on

the other hand, there are extremely few traces of different popular dialects (6).

(2) The antiquity of Hebrew is shown not only by the primitive vigour of its poetry, but also by the originality and purity of its lexical and grammatical formations: for in it significations and forms are frequently observed coming into existence, which are already firmly established when we examine the other two languages. Thus, its words of four or five letters are much less numerous than in them; many formations and inflections exist in it in greater simplicity and transparency than elsewhere; the stronger letters ם and ה, used for inflections, have not yet been worn away to י and א. On the other hand, its vocalization is no longer so simple as the Arabic, though less enfeebled than the Aramaic; and of several original modes of formation, like that of the construct state by י and ו, there are now only slight remains in existence. Compare *Gesen.* Gesch. p. 57 f.; *Ewald*, ausführl. Lehrbuch, § 6; *Hupfeld*, ausf. hebr. Gramm. p. 6 f.; *Häv.* Einl. i. § 27.

(3) We cannot rightly estimate the extent of its vocabulary and its wealth, either by the number of words and roots which occur in the Old Testament, or by the want of particles, and of adjective and other abstract nominal formations, etc.; but only by its capacity for calling into existence words and forms sufficiently numerous for the intuitions, representations, ideas, and conceptions, within which the minds of the people moved and acted. Measured thus, a language cannot be called poor which has, for instance, eighteen words for *breaking in pieces*, eight for *obscurity* or *darkness*, nine for *dying*, nine for *trust in God*, fourteen for *seeking*, twenty-four for *observing a law* (*Carpzov*, crit. sac. p. 201); though, on the other hand, the extent of its lost possessions has been exaggerated in an external manner by *A. Schultens*, de defectibus hodiern. linguæ Hebr. § 12 sq., in his Origines Hebr., 2d ed. 1761. There is a correct estimate on this point in *Gesenius*, Gesch. p. 47 ff.; *Winer*, üb. d. Armuth d. hebr. Sprache, Leipzig 1820; and *Häv.* p. 166 ff.

(4) To this class belong, in the age of Moses, *Egyptian* words: אָחוּ, "Nile-grass;" יְאוֹר, "Nile-stream;" אַבְרֵךְ, Gen. xli. 43; שֵׁשׁ, "Egyptian byssus," for which afterwards there was used בּוּץ, properly "Syrian or Phœnician byssus," though both words have a Shemitic etymology; and proper names, such as Pharaoh, Zaphnath-paaneah, etc.; yet not Behemoth in Job xl. 15, as P-ehe-mouth, "water-ox, hippopotamus," does not occur in Coptic as a compound word. Comp. the collection (much in want of sifting) and elucida-

tion of the Egyptian words in the Old Testament, in *Jablonski*, Opuscula, ed. *te Water*, vol. i., and *Gesenius*, Gesch. p. 59 f. When the Assyrian power, and still more the Babylonian, made their appearance in Western Asia and Palestine, the names of their gods, their men, their kings, their offices, forced their way into the language of the Hebrew prophets and historians,—names which some have supposed to be Persian, and have endeavoured to explain from the Persian language. Besides several older authorities, given in *Gesen.* Gesch. p. 60 ff., *Pet. v. Bohlen*, symbolæ ad interpr. S. codicis ex ling. Pers., Lips. 1822, is to be specially noticed. On the other side, see *Kleinert*, Dörptsche (theol.) Beiträge (Hamburg 1832), i. 214 ff.; more profoundly, *Pott*, etymol. Forschungen, i. p. xlii. ff.; and *M. Haug* in *Ewald's* bibl. Jahrb. v. p. 151 ff. It was a mistake to maintain the Persian origin of דָּת, Deut. xxxiii. 2, אַפַּרְסְמֹן, etc. Finally, there have passed from the Greek into the ancient Hebrew, at the utmost, the names of some musical instruments, Dan. iii. Comp. *Häv.* Einl. § 28.

(5) The poetical diction is distinguished from that of prose, so far as the lexicon is concerned, by the use of less common words [*Bleek*, pp. 91–2, says, the greater richness of diction being necessitated by the parallelisms; and he sums up especially three sources of peculiar poetical words—ancient forms, words of common life which the poet might use, and words from other dialects]. Such are אֹמֶר and מִלָּה for דָּבָר, אֱנוֹשׁ for אָדָם, אַפָּף for סָבַב, אֹרַח and נָתִיב for דֶּרֶךְ, אָתָה for בּוֹא, בֶּל for לֹא, גֶּבֶר for אִישׁ, חָזָה for חָזָה, הָגִיד for רָאָה, נָחַת for יָרַד, עָדָה for עָבַר, קָרֵב for מִלְחָמָה, שׁוּחָה for שׁוֹחַ, שָׂפָר for יָפָה, etc., which in Aramaic are the usual expressions, but in Hebrew are rather selected for special effect; they are called Chaldaisms, only *abusivè;* comp. *Hirzel*, de Chaldaismi bibl. origine et auctoritate crit., Lips. 1830, p. 13 sq. Poetry is also distinguished by the use of characteristic epithets instead of simple substantives: as אָבִיר, "the strong," = God; אַבִּיר, "the strong," = bullock or horse; חַמָּה and לְבָנָה, "the hot and the white," = sun and moon; יְחִידָה, "the only one," = life; חָרוּץ, "the sharp," = threshing-sledge; תֵּבֵל, "the productive," = [habitable] earth, etc.; though we find nothing of what is so frequent in Arabic, the *epitheta ornantia.* There are also grammatical distinctions between poetry and prose, through the use of forms with a fuller sound, as [the doubled feminine termination] יְשׁוּעָתָה, אֵימָתָה; the suffixes מוֹ, ־ימוֹ, לָמוֹ, בְּמוֹ, יְהוּ, etc.; peculiar forms, like יְפִיפִיתָ, Ps. xlv. 3, חַמְרְמַר, and others still bolder: *Gesenius*, Gesch. p. 22; and in his Lehrgebäude, see the index at "poetische Formen u. Idiotismen" (unsatisfactory); *Häv.* § 29.

(6) We cannot doubt that differences of dialect did exist in Palestine: nevertheless, *Sibboleth* for *Shibboleth*, in Judg. xii. 6, is direct evidence merely of difference of pronunciation, though it also hints at a softening of the harsh sound of the שׁ in the mouth of the people. Speaking generally, we might say that the Aramaic had early exerted its influence on the popular language; in evidence of which, see the prefix שְׁ, Judg. v. 7, vi. 17, vii. 12, viii. 26, and the plural מְרִין, ch. v. 10. But the existence of a peculiar dialect for the kingdom of Israel cannot be proved from Hosea, Amos, and Canticles. Finally, מָן for מָה, Ex. xvi. 15, and וָא, Gen. xlvii. 23, present traces of a vulgar language which was sure to be current at all times side by side with the language of books. Comp. *Hartmann*, linguist. Einleit. in d. Alte Testament, Bremen 1818, p. 94 ff. (quite uncritical); *Gesenius*, Gesch. § 15; *Häv.* § 30. [*Bleek*, who agrees with these views, adds, p. 94, *J. D. Kiesling* (Professor of Theology at Erlangen, died in 1778), de dialectis Hebræorum puris, Dissert. ii.]

§ 14. *Course of Development of the Hebrew Language.*

The Hebrew, like all the Shemitic languages, in virtue of its peculiar structure, and of the unchanging nature of Orientals, has undergone no such amazing changes in the course of ages as the Indo-Germanic languages have done, especially those in the West (1). Besides, on the one hand, the institutions of Moses gave a constitution to the Hebrew nation which restricted intercourse with other nations, and drew the twelve tribes close together into civil and religious unity, and withdrew them from the rapid currents and floods in which the life of other nations ran; and on the other hand, their literature, whose sacred character made it less liable to variations, had received a regulative principle in the Pentateuch which mightily influenced its subsequent formation. Notwithstanding all this, we can distinctly enough observe a progressive development in the writings handed down to us, so that we are quite safe in distinguishing *three* periods—that of Moses, that of David and Solomon, and that of the Exile (2).

(1) The law of three letters in each root, which governs the entire formation of the language, taken in conjunction with the impossibility of connecting the roots of verbs and particles so as to form single words from which others in turn might be formed, has given a stamp of stability to the Shemitic languages to which there is no

parallel in the Indo-Germanic. On this subject, comp. *Hengstb.* in *Tholuck's* Litterar. Anzeiger, 1833, No. 44; and as to the immobility of the Arabic, see *Kosegarten* in the Jena Allg. Lit. Zeitung, 1825, No. 121.

(2) The opinion that there were only *two* periods in the Hebrew language, which *Gesenius* (Gesch. p. 21 ff.) adopted and put in circulation, rests more upon dogmatic preconceptions than upon well-grounded and simply experimental investigation of the Hebrew vocabulary which has been handed down to us. The commencement of an experimental separation of the *usus loquendi* in the Mosaic age and after it, was made by *Joh. Jahn*, Beiträge zur Vertheid. der Echtheit des Pent., in *Bengel's* Archiv f. d. Theol. ii. 3, p. 557 ff., iii. 1, p. 168 ff.; whilst *Ewald*, in his grammars, laid down the rational foundation for the historical development of the Hebrew language. *Hengstb. ibid.*, and *Häv.* § 31 ff., occupy ground which has been secured for them by these earlier labours. Comp. *Ewald*, ausf. Lehrbuch, § 3. [*Gesenius* and the so-called critical school deny that Moses wrote the Pentateuch, and date its composition about the time of David, or even considerably later: they therefore sweep away the first of the three divisions here proposed. *Bleek*, p. 95, says upon this subject: "*Häv.* has endeavoured to present a survey of the several periods of the language, which he has prepared with the greatest diligence (i. 1, pp. 177–240); but we cannot by any means rely upon it: and the same must be said of what *Keil* gives (§ 14–17) in reference to this subject." But he says also that *Gesenius*, Geschichte d. hebr. Sprache, p. 28 ff., requires to be yet more exactly sifted; and he affirms that much uncertainty necessarily hangs over the whole matter.]

§ 15. *The Language of the Age of Moses.*

In the books of Moses we have before us certainly in general the language of his own age alone; yet the book of Genesis contains a considerable number of words and phrases which in his time had already gone out of use, and had been replaced by others, though in grammatical respects there is no material difference perceptible between it and the other books of Moses (1).

(1) The principal instances are: אֲמְתַּחַת, "sack," fifteen times in Gen. xlii.–xliv., and already here alternating with שַׂק, ch. xlii. 25, 27, 35; אֹשֶׁר in בְּאָשְׁרִי, Gen. xxx. 13, afterwards אֹשֶׁר in אַשְׁרֵי, Deut.

xxxiii. 29; הִבָּנוֹת, "to be built up," = to have children, Gen. xvi. 2, xxx. 3; בָּתַר, "to cut up a sacrifice," Gen. xv. 10, and its noun בֶּתֶר with it, which is adopted again only in Jer. xxxiv. 18, 19, and which stands poetically in Cant. ii. 17 for בְּתֶרֶ, 2 Sam. ii. 29, whereas in Lev. i. 6, etc., נָתַח is used instead; גָּמָא (*Hiph.*), "to let one sup or drink," Gen. xxiv. 17, afterwards in poetry metaphorically (*Piel*), Job xxxix. 24; דָּנָה, "to be multiplied," Gen. xlviii. 16; זָבַר, "to make a present," and זֶבֶד, Gen. xxx. 20, retained afterwards only in proper names, 1 Chron. ii. 36, vii. 21, etc.; זוּד (*Hiph.*), "to seethe, to cook," Gen. xxv. 29, afterwards only "to effervesce," for which from Ex. onwards בָּשַׁל is used, which again in Gen. xl. 10 is (*Hiph.*) "to ripen," afterwards only in Joel iv. 13 (*Kal*) "to be ripe;" וָלַד, Gen. xi. 30, for which elsewhere invariably יָלַד, except that the MSS. waver between the two forms in 2 Sam. vi. 23; חַוָּה = חַיָּה, Gen. iii. 11 [?], 20, iv. 1; חוּם, Gen. xxx. 32, 33, 35, 40; מֹנִים, "(ten) times," Gen. xxxi. 7, 41, for which already in Num. xiv. 22 פְּעָמִים; עָקַר, "to bind," Gen. xxii. 9, and עָקוֹד, "striped, streaked," Gen. xxx. 35, 39, 40, xxxi. 8, 10, 12; עָשַׂק (*Hithp.*), "to quarrel," and עֵשֶׂק, Gen. xxvi. 20; צָעִיף, "veil," Gen. xxiv. 65, xxxviii. 14, 19; בֵּית הַסֹּהַר, "prison," Gen. xxxix. 20–23, xl. 3, 5; וַיָּרֶק אֶת־חֲנִיכָיו, "he led forth his trained (servants)," Gen. xiv. 14; עֶרְוַת הָאָרֶץ, "the nakedness of the land," Gen. xlii. 9, 12; מְמַחֲוֵי קֶשֶׁת, "archers," Gen. xxi. 16, instead of the verbs in later use, with the noun unchanged, מֹשְׁבֵי, Isa. lxvi. 19, 1 Kings xxii. 34, or דֶּרֶךְ, Ps. vii. 13, etc. Also many *ἅπαξ λεγομ.* in Genesis may belong to this class.

All the greater and more obvious is the distinction between the language of writings in the age of Moses and in that of David and Solomon. There is an antique character about the former which is wanting in the latter: it may be recognised partly in archaic words and forms, partly in the poetical colouring of the prose and the primitive originality of the poetry. The Pentateuch therefore, on the one hand, contains a great number of words, and forms of words, and phrases, which never again occur (2), or of which there are only isolated instances afterwards retained (3), or which passed out of sight in the intermediate period, and did not reappear till writers, in the exile and after it, adopted them from the Pentateuch (4); and, on the other hand, it still contains many words and phrases in prose which are found afterwards only in poetry (5), or which have altered their signification (6) or their form (7).

(2) Particularly striking is the use of הוּא for the feminine in 195 places, the proper feminine occurring only in 11 places; and of נַעַר for the feminine in 21 places, so constantly that נערה may quite well have been introduced into the text at Deut. xxii. 19 by later copyists, [as in that chapter it repeatedly occurs in the Qri]. This neglect to distinguish the gender in the form of the word is an unmistakeable proof of the higher antiquity of the language. The same holds good of the pronoun, with the article prefixed, הַלָּזֶה, Gen. xxiv. 65, xxxvii. 19, which in all books after the Pentateuch is shortened into הַלָּז, Judg. vi. 20, 1 Sam. xiv. 1, xvii. 26, 2 Kings iv. 25, xxiii. 17, Dan. viii. 16, Zech. ii. 8; while in Ezek. xxxvi. 35 appears the unique form הַלָּזוּ (comp. *Ewald*, ausf. Lehrbuch, § 103, *d*). Further, הָאֵל for הָאֵלֶּה only in the Pentateuch, Gen. xix. 8, 25, xxvi. 3, 4, Lev. xviii. 27, Deut. iv. 42, vii. 22, xix. 11, and imitated 1 Chron. xx. 8, yet without the article (comp. *Ewald*, § 183, *a*): the formation of the construct state by union-vowels, whether ־ִי, Gen. xxxi. 39 (in prose), xlix. 11, Ex. xv. 6, Deut. xxxiii. 16 (these three in poetry), which is used by subsequent poets somewhat more freely, and not precisely for the strict construct (comp. *Ewald*, § 211, *b*, who yet is mistaken when he includes Lev. xxvi. 42, Jer. xxxiii. 20, in this class), besides only in proper names such as Melchizedek, Adonizedek, Ammiel; or whether the vowel be î in חַיְתוֹ־אֶרֶץ, Gen. i. 24 (a formula which is repeated by poets and prophets, Ps. l. 10, civ. 11, 20, Isa. lvi. 9, Zeph. ii. 14), בְּנוֹ, Num. xxiv. 3, 15 (as afterwards מַעְיְנוֹ, Ps. cxiv. 8; comp. *Ewald*, § 211, *b*, 2): the formation of the infinitive construct in verbs ל״ה without ת, as עֲשֹׂה, Gen. l. 20, and the thoroughly archaic עֲשֹׂתוֹ, Ex. xviii. 18 (comp. *Ewald*, § 256, *c*); עֲשׂוֹ, Gen. xxxi. 28 (afterwards only isolated cases in poetry, Ps. ci. 3, Prov. xxi. 3); רְאֹה, Gen. xlviii. 11; likewise נְתֹן instead of תֵּת, Gen. xxxviii. 9, Num. xx. 21: the archaic forms, יְבַסְּיֵמוֹ, Ex. xv. 5; יְחַמְנָה, Gen. xxx. 38: the abbreviated forms of the imperative, answering to its original character, שְׁמַעְנָ, Gen. iv. 23, and קְרָאן, Ex. ii. 20: the plural termination ן in the perfect, only Deut. viii. 3, 16 (and poetically, Isa. xxvi. 16; comp. *Ewald*, § 190, *b*); and in the imperfect,—a form which certainly occurs often out of the Pentateuch, and does not disappear till the time of the exile, yet is far most frequent in the Pentateuch, 105 times (comp. *König*, Alt-testamentlichen Studien, ii. 165 ff.): the form תִּתַּצֵּב for תִּיתַצֵּב, Ex. ii. 4, whereas elsewhere ת is transposed only with sibilants: the verb חָיָה = חָיִי, only Gen. iii. 22, v. 5, Ex. i. 16, Num. xxi. 8: the old formation of nouns with ־ָם and ־ֹם instead of ־ַיִם and ־וֹן—, in סָלָם, Gen. xxviii. 12; בְּגָם, Ex. viii. 13, 14; פְּדֹיֹם, Num. iii. 49; along with פְּדוֹיִם, Ex. xxi. 30. Of *words*

and phrases disused after the time of Moses, the following are the principal:—אָבִיב, "ear of corn," Ex. ix. 31, which is joined with the participle קָלוּי, "roasted ears," Lev. ii. 14 (whereas already in Josh. v. 11, קָלוּי alone; elsewhere קָלִי, Lev. xxiii. 14, Ruth ii. 14, 1 Sam. xvii. 17, etc.), and with the noun חֹדֶשׁ, "the month of ears of corn" [Eng. version, "the month Abib"], Ex. xiii. 4, xxiii. 15, xxxiv. 18, Deut. xvi. 1: the verb אָיַב, "to be at enmity," only Ex. xxiii. 22: אָסוֹן, "mischance, harm," Gen. xlii. 4, 38, xliv. 29, Ex. xxi. 22, 23 (for which afterwards אֵיד, Ps. xviii. 19, etc.): חַג הָאָסִיף, "the feast of ingathering," = the feast of tabernacles, only Ex. xxiii. 16 and xxxiv. 22; indeed, אָסִיף is not found again: נֶאֱסַף אֶל־עַמָּיו, Gen. xxv. 8, 17, xxxv. 29, xlix. 33 (and the noun in the singular, ver. 29), Num. xx. 24, xxvii. 13, xxxi. 2, Deut. xxxii. 50, and shortened to הֶאָסֵף, Num. xx. 6 (for which already in Judg. ii. 10, נֶאֱסַף אֶל־אֲבוֹת, or נֶאֱסַף אֶל־קִבְרוֹת, 2 Kings xxii. 20, 2 Chron. xxxiv. 28, but chiefly שָׁכַב עִם אֲבֹתָיו, 1 Kings ii. 10, xi. 43, etc.: this last phrase occurs indeed already in Gen. xlvii. 30, Deut. xxxi. 16, but used to express the state subsequent to a person's being "gathered to his fathers," with which on the other hand it is identified, and for which it is used in Kings and Chronicles): עַמִּים itself deserves notice here, as it is used in the Pentateuch for "fellow-countrymen," the Latin *populares*,—a use unknown in the later books: אָסַר אִסָּר עַל־נַפְשׁוֹ, "he bound upon himself a binding," that is, an interdict, Num. xxx. 3–15 (comp. the Chaldee אֱסָר, "an interdict," Dan. vi. 8 ff.: נוּן, "to drive, bring," Num. xi. 31 and Ps. xc. 10 (perhaps also Ps. lxxi. 6): נוֹגָל, "young fowl," Gen. xv. 9, Deut. xxxii. 11: נַחַת, "belly," Gen. iii. 14, Lev. xi. 42: זָכוּר, "male," Ex. xxiii. 17, xxxiv. 23, Deut. xvi. 16, xx. 13; also the combination of זָכָר and נְקֵבָה, "male and female," only in Gen., Lev., and Deut. (for which in Jer. xxxi. 22 גֶּבֶר is used with נְקֵבָה): חֵלֶף, "instead of," Num. xviii. 21, 31: חֶרְמֵשׁ, "sickle," Deut. xvi. 9, xxiii. 26 (afterwards מַגָּל, Joel iv. 13, Jer. l. 16): מֶנָא, "basket," Deut. xxvi. 2, 4, xxviii. 5, 17 (afterwards דּוּד): הִתְיַלֵּד, "to be registered in the lists of births," Num. i. 18 (for which afterwards הִתְיַחֵשׂ, frequent in Chron., Ezra, and Neh.): כָּסַס, "to compute," Ex. xii. 4; from which מֶכֶס, "the computed sum or number" [Eng. version, "tribute"], Num. xxxi. 28, 37–41, and מִכְסָה, "computation," Ex. xii. 4, Lev. xxvii. 23,—a contracted construct of which we are safe in believing to be מִסַּת, "according to," a ἅπαξ λεγ., Deut. xvi. 10: כִּבְשָׁן, "smelting furnace," Gen. xix. 28, Ex. ix. 8, 10, xix. 18: מָסַר, "to fall away" [Eng. ver. "to commit (a trespass)"], Num. xxxi. 16, and ver. 5 (*Niph.*), "to be picked out" [Eng. ver. "to be delivered"] for soldiers: מַסְוֶה, "a covering, veil," Ex. xxxiv. 33, 34, 35, of un-

certain origin [one of the Arabic words of the Pentateuch, according to *J. H. Arnold;* as also כּוּמָז, Eng. ver. "tablets," he takes to be the golden drops of the Arabs]; סְנֶה, "prickly bush," Ex. iii. 2–4, Deut. xxxiii. 16: עָרַף (*Kal* and *Hiph.*), "to be, or to have, over," Ex. xvi. 18, 23, xxvi. 12, 13, Lev. xxv. 27, Num. iii. 46, 48, 49: עֵקֶר, "shoot" [Eng. ver. "stock"], of men, Lev. xxv. 47 (comp. the Chaldee עִקַּר, "stump," Dan. iv. 12, 20 [Eng. ver. 15, 23]), elsewhere only עָקַר, "to root out," and עֲקָרָה, "barren:" בֵּין הָעַרְבַּיִם, "between the two evenings," Ex. xii. 6, xvi. 12, etc.: פֶּדֶר, "fat," Lev. i. 8, 12, viii. 20 (elsewhere חֵלֶב): נֶדֶר with the verb פָּלָא, "to consecrate something vowed," (*Piel*) Lev. xxii. 21, Num. xv. 3, 8, and (*Hiph.*) Lev. xxvii. 2, Num. vi. 2: פָּצַל, "to peel," Gen. xxx. 37, 38 (afterwards חָשַׂף, Joel i. 7): פָּרַם, "to rend garments," Lev. x. 6, xiii. 45, xxi. 10, = קָרַע, Gen. xxxvii. 29, and often afterwards: פָּרַשׁ = נָקַב, "to define, fix distinctly," Lev. xxiv. 12, Num. xv. 34: צָבָה, "to swell," said of the body, Num. v. 21, 22, 27: חַיִּקּוּם, "living things," Gen. vii. 4, 23, Deut. xi. 6: קָמַץ, "to take a handful," Lev. ii. 2, v. 12, Num. v. 26; קֹמֶץ, "handful," Lev. ii. 2, v. 12, vi. 8, and in the plural, Gen. xli. 47, *plenis manipulis*, "by handfuls:" קֶרִי or הָלַךְ בְּקֶרִי, "to walk contrary to one," Lev. xxvi. 21–41 (seven times): רִגְלַיִם, "(three) times," Ex. xxiii. 14, Num. xxii. 28, 32, 33: שְׁאֵר בְּשָׂרוֹ, "blood-relation" [Eng. ver. "next of kin"], Lev. xviii. 6, xxv. 49; and שְׁאֵר alone in the same sense, Lev. xviii. 12, 13, xx. 19, xxi. 2, Num. xxvii. 11; and שְׁאֵרָה, "consanguinity," Lev. xviii. 17 (in subsequent writings שְׁאֵר is "flesh," as it is "food" in Ex. xxi. 10): שְׁגַר, "the young brought forth by animals," Ex. xiii. 12, Deut. vii. 13, xxviii. 4, 18, 51: שְׁתַם = סָתַם, "to shut," Num. xxiv. 3, 15 (comp. *Hengstb.* Balaam, p. 136), [so in the margin of the Eng. ver.]. Extremely antique are also the poetical phrase, "to cover the eye of the earth," Ex. x. 5, 15, Num. xxii. 5, 11 (comp. *Tholuck*, litterar. Anzeiger, 1833, No. 45, p. 354); and two others in which the turn of expression can be explained only from the Arabic, לַעֲלוֹת, with יַעְפִּלוּ, Num. xiv. 44, and with הָהִינוּ, Deut. i. 41.

(3) The full form of the suffix of the noun הוּ־, Gen. i. 12, 21, 25, vi. 20, vii. 14, Lev. xi. 16, 22, 29, Deut. xiv. 15; elsewhere only three times in the whole Old Testament, Judg. xix. 24, Job xxv. 3, Nah. i. 13 (excepting the nouns ending in ־ה, to which also רֵעַ belongs, as really it is a shortened form, though twice exceptionally it has רֵעוּ, Jer. vi. 21, Job xxxvi. 33; and the words פֶּה and אָח follow the same method, having sometimes פִּיו and אֲחִיו, sometimes פִּיהוּ and אֲחִיהוּ): the suffix ־הוּ instead of ו, very frequent in the Pentateuch, Gen. ix. 21, xii. 8, xiii. 3, xxxv. 21, xlix. 11, Ex. xxii. 4, 26, xxxii. 17, Lev. xxiii. 13,

Num. x. 36 (besides only in Josh. xi. 16; isolated cases in poetry, and as an archaism in writings of the exile, Kings and Ezek.): יָיַם instead of יָם, Gen. xxiv. 33, l. 26 (and Judg. xii. 3): עַל אוֹדוֹת, Gen. xxi. 11, 25, xxvi. 32, Ex. xviii. 8, Num. xii. 1, xiii. 24 (then also Josh. xiv. 6, Judg. vi. 7, 2 Sam. xiii. 16, Jer. iii. 8): אִשֶּׁה very frequent in Ex., Lev., and Num., also Deut. xviii. 1 (besides only in Josh. xiii. 14, 1 Sam. ii. 28): אֲשֶׁד הַנְּחָלִים, "the outpouring of the torrents" [Eng. ver. "the stream of the brooks"], the valley into which they run, Num. xxi. 15; and אַשְׁרוֹת, "the hill country" [Eng. ver. "the springs," or left as a proper name], Deut. iii. 17, iv. 49 (also Josh. x. 40, xii. 3, 8, xiii. 20; comp. *Keil* on Joshua, p. 202): בְּנִפּוֹ "with his body" and nothing more, Ex. xxi. 3, 4 (elsewhere only נַף = נַו, "back," Prov. ix. 3): זְנַב, "to cut off the rear," Deut. xxv. 18 (and Josh. x. 19): הָאֶזְרָח, "native," Ex. xii. 19, 48, 49, Lev. xvi. 29, xvii. 15, xviii. 26, xix. 34, xxiii. 42, xxiv. 16, 22, Num. ix. 14, xv. 13, 29, 30 (elsewhere only in Josh. viii. 33, Ezek. xlvii. 22; and of an untransplanted tree, Ps. xxxvii. 35): יְשֻׁרוּן, Deut. xxxii. 15, xxxiii. 5, 26 (and Isa. xliv. 2): לוּן (*Niph.* and *Hiph.*), "to murmur," in Ex. and Num. sixteen times, and its noun תְּלוּנוֹת eight times (elsewhere only Josh. ix. 18, the verb): מִסְפּוֹא, "fodder," Gen. xxiv. 25, 32, xlii. 27, xliii. 24 (and Judg. xix. 19): קְלוֹט, "diminutive," Lev. xxii. 23: עִיר מִקְלָט, "city of refuge," Num. xxxv. 6 ff. (besides only in Josh. xx. 2, xxi. 13 ff., and 1 Chron. vi. 42, 52): סַל, "a basket" for bread, etc., Gen. xl. 16–18, Ex. xxix. 3, 23, Lev. viii. 2, 26, 31, Num. iv. 15, 17, 19 (and Judg. vi. 19; also סַלְסִלָּה, Jer. vi. 9): עָבַט, "to give a pledge," and in *Hiph.* "to lend on pledge," Deut. xv. 6, 8, xxiv. 10; also עֲבוֹט, its noun, Deut. xxiv. 10–13 (in later books only עִבֵּט אֹרַח, "to change one's course," turning to the right or left, Joel ii. 7; and עַבְטִים, "mass of pledges" [Eng. ver. "thick clay"], Hab. ii. 6): רָעַץ = רָצַץ, "to break in pieces," Ex. xv. 6 (metaphorically, Judg. x. 8): likewise the geographical designation עַרְבוֹת מוֹאָב, Num. xxii. 1, xxvi. 3, 63, xxxiii. 48–50, xxxv. 1, Deut. xxxiv. 1, 8 (also Josh. xiii. 32, whereas it does not occur in Judg. xi. 12 ff.; comp. *Tholuck*, *ibid.* p. 353).

(4) Such are אַלּוּף, "head of a tribe" in Edom, Gen. xxxvi. 15 ff., Ex. xv. 15 (also 1 Chron. i. 51 ff.); and of heads of tribes in general, Zech. ix. 7, xii. 5, 6: אָצַל, "to lay aside," Gen. xxvii. 36, followed by מִן, "to take from," Num. xi. 17, 25; reappearing first in Ezek. xlii. 6 and Eccles. ii. 10: גָּבִיעַ, "cup, goblet," Gen. xliv. 2, 12, 16, 17; "calyx of a flower," Ex. xxv. 31, 33, 34, xxxvii. 17; then = בּוֹס, Jer. xxxv. 5: גָּלָה עֶרְוָה, "to have sexual connection" [with implication at least of "incest," or the like], frequent in Levit.; elsewhere only

Ezek. xxii. 10, comp. xvi. 37 and xxiii. 10: כִּבְרַת הָאָרֶץ, Gen. xxxv. 16, xlviii. 7; copied 2 Kings v. 19: מִלֵּא אַחֲרֵי, "to follow" Jehovah "fully," Num. xiv. 24, xxxii. 11, 12, Josh. xiv. 8, 9, 14, 1 Kings xi. 6: מֵאָה, still frequent as a substantive; adopted first again in the very latest writings, Esth. i. 11 [? 4], Eccles. viii. 12, Neh. v. 11: מִין, "species," twenty-nine times in the Pentateuch; and in Ezek. xlvii. 10, for which the Chaldee זַן was in use later, Ps. cxliv. 13, 2 Chron. xvi. 14: עֲלָטָה, "darkness," Gen. xv. 17, also Ezek. xii. 6, 7, 12: עָמִית, "next neighbour," eleven times in Lev., again Zech. xiii. 7: עֲרִירִי, "childless," Gen. xv. 2, Lev. xx. 21, also Jer. xxii. 30: פֶּרֶךְ, "grinding oppression," Ex. i. 13, 14, Lev. xxv. 43, 46, 53, and again Ezek. xxxiv. 4: פִּי שְׁנַיִם, ["a double portion"], Deut. xxi. 17; adopted again, 2 Kings ii. 9 and Zech. xiii. 8 (comp. *Keil* on Kings, p. 328, and *Hengstb.* Christologie, iii. p. 536): קָרְבָּן, "a gift offered to God," frequently in Ex. and Lev.; also of the presents from the heads of the tribes, Num. vii. 17 ff.; not again till Ezek. xx. 28, xl. 43: רֵיחַ נִיחֹחַ, Gen. viii. 21, and frequently in Ex., Lev., and Num.; elsewhere only Ezek. vi. 13, xvi. 19, xx. 28, 41; and in Chaldee, Ezra vi. 10, Dan. ii. 46: רָחַף (*Piel*), Gen. i. 2, Deut. xxxii. 11, besides (*Kal*) Jer. xxiii. 9: שָׂעִיר, "he-goat," nearly fifty times in Gen., Lev., and Num.; again, Ezek. xliii. 22, 25, xlv. 23, comp. Dan. viii. 21: שָׂרַץ and שֶׁרֶץ, frequently in the Pentateuch; beyond it only Ps. cv. 30, Ezek. xlvii. 9. Also the phrases זָבַת חָלָב וּדְבָשׁ, Ex. iii. 8, 17, and often, on to Deut. xxxi. 20 and Josh. v. 6; afterwards only Jer. xi. 5, xxxii. 22, and Ezek. xx. 6 [in expressions which are almost quotations]: בְּעֶצֶם הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה, Gen. vii. 13, 17, 23, Ex. xii. 17, etc., Deut. xxxii. 48; also Josh. v. 11, x. 27; then Ezek. ii. 3, xxiv. 2, xxxvii. 7 [?], xl. 1: עָשָׂה שְׁפָטִים, only Ex. xii. 12 and Num. xxxiii. 4; adopted anew, 2 Chron. xxiv. 24, Ezek. v. 10, 15, xi. 9, xvi. 41, xxv. 11, xxviii. 22, 26, xxx. 14, 19. Another antiquated expression is common in the Pentateuch, "he lifted up his eyes and saw,"—merely a sensuous picturing without especial emphasis, which reappears in Dan., Ezek., and Zech.: in the other books it is seldom used, and then only to give prominence to the fact that what was seen was unexpected, as in Josh. v. 13, 1 Sam. vi. 13.

(5) For instance, אֵד, "mist," Gen. ii. 6 and Job xxxvi. 27: נֶאְדַּר, "to show one's magnificence," Ex. xv. 6, 11 and (*Hiph.*) Isa. xlii. 21: אֹרַח, "path," Gen. xviii. 11; later only in poetry, in which it is frequent: גָּוַע, "to expire," frequently in Gen. and Num., copied in Josh. xxii. 20; elsewhere only in Psalms, Job, and Lam. i. 19, Zech. xiii. 8: חֵלֶב, ["the fat," hence in the sense of] "the best," Gen. xlv. 18, Num. xviii. 12, Deut. xxxii. 14; nowhere else but Ps. lxxxi. 17, cxlvii. 14: מִלֵּל, "to speak," Gen. xxi. 7, elsewhere only in Job viii. 2, xxiii. 3, Ps.

cvi. 2; and the noun מִלָּה, which is frequent in poetry: נָטַר, "take aim at" [in Eng. ver. very paraphrastically, "bear any grudge"], Lev. xix. 18 (whence מַטָּרָה, "a mark," 1 Sam. xx. 20, Job xvi. 12, Lam. iii. 12); afterwards poetical = שָׁמַר, "to keep watch," Cant. i. 6, viii. 11, 12: עִנָּה נֶפֶשׁ, "to afflict the soul, to fast," Lev. xvi. 31, xxiii. 27, 32, Num. xxix. 7, xxx. 14, elsewhere only in Ps. xxxv. 13, Isa. lviii. 3; whilst צוּם comes into use in prose: הֶעָתִיק, "to set out," Gen. xii. 8, xxvi. 22; elsewhere only in Job, where it is frequent, and in Prov. xxv. 1 in a different meaning: קָרַן, "to send out rays," Ex. xxxiv. 29, 30, 35; from which comes קְרָנַיִם, "rays" [see Eng. ver. margin], Hab. iii. 4.

(6) So אֲצִילִים, "nobles," Ex. xxiv. 11, whereas in Isa. xli. 9, "uttermost parts" of the earth; yet comp. אֶצֶל, "knuckle," Jer. xxxviii. 12, Ezek. xiii. 18, xli. 8: בָּטַח, "to trust" in earthly might, Deut. xxviii. 52; frequently afterwards in the sense of trusting in God: גָּלָה, "to open, uncover," Num. xxiv. 4, 16, Lev. xviii. 6 ff., and often; afterwards also "to go into exile," 2 Sam. xv. 19, and so in Isaiah and the literature of the exile frequently: חָרַץ, "to point, or sharpen," used of a dog's tongue in Ex. xi. 7 and Josh. x. 21; and חָרוּץ, "wounded" [Eng. ver. "maimed"], Lev. xxii. 22, in the other books only in derived significations: חָרַף, in the *Niph.* "betrothed" (properly "plucked" for the husband), still manifests its original sensuous meaning, whilst in the other books the metaphorical meaning "to reproach" (*conviciis carpere*) alone appears; so also חֶרְפָּה, "reproach," is very rare in the Pentateuch, only Gen. xxx. 23, xxxiv. 14, besides Josh. v. 9, and appears more frequently only from the books of Samuel onwards: כָּלָא in the Pentateuch appears to have meant "to separate;" hence the noun כִּלְאַיִם, "two heterogeneous things," Lev. xix. 19, Deut. xxii. 9; but later it is "to close, restrain:" כֶּסֶל, "the loin," Lev. iii. 4, 10, 15, iv. 9, vii. 4, and so also in Job xv. 27; but later it is "hope," Ps. lxxviii. 7, Prov. iii. 26, etc., or "folly," Ps. xlix, 14, etc., whence comes כְּסִיל, "a fool," which is unknown in the Pentateuch: נָדַב, "to incite, make willing," only Ex. xxv. 2, xxxv. 21, 29; then (*Hithp.*) "to offer oneself willingly," Judg. v. 2, 9; and "to present willingly," in Chron., Ezra, and Neh., twelve times: נְשִׂיאִים, "princes," frequently in the Pentateuch, and in Josh., Chron., and Ezek., books which are dependent on it, elsewhere only 1 Kings viii. 1, xi. 34, and Ezra i. 8; whereas it means "vapours" in Prov. xxv. 14, Ps. cxxxv. 7, Jer. x. 13, li. 16: פַּחִים, in the Pentateuch, "metallic plates," Ex. xxxix. 3, Num. xvii. 3; afterwards "snares," Josh. xxiii. 13, and in the following books: כַּף, "a basin" for holding blood, Ex. xii. 22, 1 Kings vii. 50; afterwards in the sense of

"threshold," often from Judg. xix. 27 onwards: מִקְרָא, "convocation," nineteen times in Ex., Lev., and Num., and copied in Isa. i. 13, iv. 5; afterwards "the law which was to be read in public," Neh. viii. 8: רְהָטִים, "troughs of running water," Gen. xxx. 38, 41, Ex. ii. 16; afterwards only in Cant. vii. 6, meaning "flowing locks:" רַכָּשׁ, only Gen. xii. 5, xxxi. 18, xxxvi. 6, xlvi. 6; and the noun רְכוּשׁ, Gen. xii. 5 and often, Num. xvi. 32, xxxv. 3, then first again in Dan., Ezra, and Chron.; yet there it is used for "cattle," 2 Chron. xxxi. 3, through a mistake as to its original meaning in the Pentateuch, "lifeless possessions," as distinguished from those possessed of life: צִנִּנִים, "thorns, pricks," Num. xxxiii. 55 and Josh. xxiii. 13; which afterwards is צִנִּים, Prov. xxii. 5, Job v. 5.

(7) Comp. בָּטָא (*Piel*), "to speak unadvisedly," Lev. v. 4, from which it is borrowed in Ps. cvi. 33, and מִבְטָא, Num. xxx. 7, 9; for which in Prov. xii. 18, בָּטָה, spelt with ה and in *Kal:* גֶּרֶשׁ, "something ground down," Lev. ii. 14, 16; afterwards גָּרַס, "to break by rubbing," Lam. iii. 16, Ps. cxix. 20: זֵעָה, "sweat," Gen. iii. 19; afterwards זִיעַ, Ezek. xliv. 18: זַעֲוָה, "vexation," Deut. xxviii. 25; afterwards זַוָּעָה, Isa. xxviii. 19, Jer. xv. 4, xxiv. 9, xxix. 18, xxxiv. 17, 2 Chron. xxix. 8 (only Ezek. xxiii. 46 has the old form again): זִקֻן, "old age," Gen. xlviii. 10, and זְקֵנִים, Gen. xxi. 2, 7, xxxvii. 3, xliv. 20; whereas the usual form afterwards, זִקְנָה, occurs only in Gen. xxiv. 36: חִתָּה, "dread," Gen. xxxv. 5, and חֵת, Gen. ix. 2, Job vi. 21, xli. 25; from the time of David, מְחִתָּה, Ps. lxxxix. 41, in Prov. seven times, and in Isa. liv. 14, Jer. xvii. 17, xlviii. 39; finally in Ezek., חִתִּית, eight times: מַטְעַמִּים, "dainty morsels," Gen. xxvii. 4, 7, 9, 14, 17, 31; afterwards מַטַּעֲמוֹת, Prov. xxiii. 3, 6. Alongside of כֶּבֶשׂ, "a lamb," there occurs thirteen times in Gen., Lev., Num., and Deut., the original [this is denied by *Gesenius*] form כֶּשֶׂב, keeping nearer to the etymology (*Häv.* Einl. i. 1, p. 198), which does not occur again: along with נָקֵב there is often in Num. xxii. and xxiii. the form קָבֵב, which is etymologically connected with קֵבָה, "a chamber," Num. xxv. 8; קֵבָה, "the womb," *ibid.;* and קֵבָה, "a part of the stomach." Instead of מַמְלָכָה, "kingdom," in the Pentateuch, we have the forms מַמְלָכוּת, Josh. xiii. 12, etc., 1 Sam. xv. 28, etc.; and later, מַלְכוּת, 1 Sam. xx. 31, Ps. xlv. 7, and very often in Chron., Dan., and Ezra; and the original form is more and more displaced by these. The *Hiphil* of נָשָׁה, "to lend," Deut. xv. 2, xxiv. 10 (as also the participle מַשֶּׁה, Ex. xxii. 24), never occurs in a later age, but *Kal* alone: נְתִינִים, of the Levites, Num. iii. 9, viii. 16, 19, xviii. 6, and borrowed from these passages in 1 Chron. vi. 33; afterwards נְתִינִים, of the temple-bondsmen, 1 Chron. ix. 2, and often in Ezra and Neh.: עָרַב, "to be

surety," only in Gen. xliv. 32, and עֵרָבוֹן, "pledge," Gen. xxxviii. 17, 18, 20; afterwards עֵרָבָה, 1 Sam. xvii. 18, Prov. xvii. 18: צָחַק, "to laugh," "to jest," in Gen. twelve times, Ex. xxxii. 6; elsewhere only in Judg. xvi. 25, where, however, already the softened form שָׂחַק occurs, as it does fifty-two times in the Old Testament, yet never in the Pentateuch, from which the original form is re-adopted only so late as in Ezek. xxiii. 32.

§ 16. *The Language in the Age of David and Solomon.*

The second or intermediate age of the Hebrew language reaches from Samuel to Hezekiah, attaining its zenith under David and Solomon. These kings accomplished much for the advancement of the life of the state and of the people as a whole, by wise and just administration, on which the blessing of God rested; and in the department of literature they did no less for the cultivation and development of the language, by services in accordance with their rich mental endowments. There are therefore good reasons for distinguishing this period by their names, though it must not be restricted to the time in which they reigned. Linguistic progress begins to be observable in the book of Joshua (1); yet it becomes of greater consequence under Samuel, in the books of Judges, Ruth, and Samuel, the essential elements of which belong to this age (2).

(1) In the disappearance of the archaisms (see § 15, Note 2). In new conceptions and expressions, like גִּבּוֹרֵי הַחַיִל, Josh. i. 14, vi. 2, viii. 3, x. 7 (instead of בְּנֵי חַיִל, Deut. iii. 18): נֹאד, "skin-bottle," Josh. ix. 4, 13, Judg. iv. 19, etc. (for חֵמָת, Gen. xxi. 14, 15, 19): הִצִּית, "to set on fire, to burn," Josh. viii. 8, 19, and very often in the subsequent books: עָנַת, "to come down," Josh. xv. 18, Judg. i. 14, iv. 21: קָצִין, "prince, leader," Josh. x. 24, Judg. xi. 6, 11, etc.: סְרָנִים, "princes" of the Philistines, Josh. xiii. 3, Judg. iii. 3, etc.; also in 1 Kings vii. 30, but in the sense of "axles:" פַּח, "snare," Josh. xxiii. 13 (comp. § 15, Note 6): שָׁקַט, "to rest," Josh. xi. 23, xiv. 15, Judg. xviii. 7, 27, and very often afterwards. In peculiar formation of words, like מַמְלָכוּת (comp. § 15, Note 7): שִׁמַע, "report," Josh. vi. 27, ix. 9 (instead of שְׁמַע, Gen. xxix. 13, etc.): תְּחִנָּה, "supplication," Josh. xi. 20, 1 Kings viii. 28, etc.: יִרְאָ, Josh. xxii. 25 (instead of יִרְאָה, Deut. iv. 10, v. 26, etc.); although the book of Joshua rests very closely upon the *usus loquendi* in the books of Moses, with which its contents are also most intimately connected; comp. § 15, Notes 3–5.

(2) New conceptions and words, formed in course of the progressive development of the domestic, civil, political, and religious life of the nation: אָזַר, "to gird," 1 Sam. ii. 4, etc.: אֵזוֹר, "girdle," 2 Kings i. 8, Job xii. 17, etc.; along with חָגַר, Ex. xii. 11, Lev. viii. 7, etc.; חָגוֹר, 1 Sam. xviii. 4, etc.; חֲגֹרָה, 2 Sam. xviii. 11 (Gen. iii. 7), etc.: גַּת, "wine-press," Judg. vi. 11, Joel iv. 13, etc.: פּוּרָה, Isa. lxiii. 3, Hag. ii. 16; along with יֶקֶב, Num. xviii. 27, 30, Deut. xv. 14, xvi. 13, Judg. vii. 25, etc.: דּוּד, "a pot, a basket," 1 Sam. ii. 14, 2 Kings x. 7, etc.: טִיט, "mire," 2 Sam. xxii. 43, etc.; "mortar," Isa. xli. 25; along with חֹמֶר, "mortar," Gen. xi. 3, "mire," Isa. x. 6, etc.: טָלֶה, "a young lamb," 1 Sam. vii. 9, Isa. lxv. 25; טְלָאִים, 1 Sam. xv. 4, Isa. xl. 11; whereas טָלוּא, "speckled, or spotted," Gen. xxx. 32, 33, 35, and "patched," Josh. ix. 5: מַגָּל (see § 15, Note 2): מוֹרָה, "razor," Judg. xiii. 5, xvi. 17, 1 Sam. i. 11; along with תַּעַר, Num. vi. 5, viii. 7, Ps. lii. 4, etc.: נגן, "to play a stringed instrument," 1 Sam. xvi. 16–18, 23, 2 Kings iii. 15, Ps. xxxiii. 3, etc.; whence נְגִינָה, Ps. iv. 1, vi. 1, etc.; and later, מַנְגִּינָה, Lam. iii. 63: פָּלַח, "to cleave, to furrow," 2 Kings iv. 39, Prov. vii. 23, Job xvi. 13; and פֶּלַח, "a segment," 1 Sam. xxx. 12, Cant. iv. 3, or "a mill-stone," Judg. ix. 53, 2 Sam. xi. 21, Job xli. 16: פְּלֹנִי אַלְמֹנִי, "such a one," Ruth iv. 1, 1 Sam. xxi. 3, 2 Kings vi. 8: פֶּרֶד and פִּרְדָּה, "mule," 2 Sam. xviii. 9, 1 Kings i. 33, 38, etc.: צָרַף, "to melt, to refine," Judg. vii. 4, xvii. 4, and often in the Psalms and the prophets: מַצְרֵף, "crucible," Prov. xvii. 3, xxvii. 21: רוּשׁ, "to be poor," Ps. xxxiv. 11; רָאשׁ and רֵשׁ, 1 Sam. xviii. 23, 2 Sam. xii. i. 3, etc.: רֵישׁ, "poverty," Prov. vi. 11, x. 15, etc.: רֶכֶשׁ, "courser, horse," 1 Kings v. 8, Mic. i. 13; and סוּסָה, Cant. i. 9, along with סוּס, Gen. xlvii. 17, and very often afterwards: נָגִיד, "prince," 1 Sam. ix. 16, x. 1, etc.; also two other words with the same meaning, namely the poetical רוֹזֵן, Judg. v. 3, Ps. ii. 2, etc., and the metaphorical פַּנּוֹת, Judg. xx. 2, 1 Sam. xiv. 38: עָטַר, "to surround," 1 Sam. xxiii. 26; "to crown," Ps. v. 13, viii. 6, etc.: עֲטָרָה, "a crown," 2 Sam. xii. 30, Ps. xxi. 4, etc.: כָּתַר (*Piel*), "to surround," Judg. xx. 43, Ps. xxii. 13, etc.: כֹּתֶרֶת, "the capital of a pillar," 1 Kings vii. 16–18, etc.; afterwards כֶּתֶר, "a crown," Esth. i. 11, ii. 17, vi. 8: צִנָּה, "shield," 1 Sam. xvii. 7, 41, 1 Kings x. 16, etc.; and שֶׁלֶט, 2 Sam. viii. 7, Cant. iv. 4, along with מָגֵן, Gen. xv. 1, Deut. xxxiii. 29, Judg. v. 8, etc.: צָרִיחַ, "castle," Judg. ix. 46, 49, 1 Sam. xiii. 6: שָׁסַס and שָׁסָה, "to plunder," Judg. ii. 14, 16, 1 Sam. xiv. 48, and very often: יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת, very frequent from 1 Sam. i. 3, 11 onwards, but never previously: הֵיכָל, 1 Sam. i. 9, iii. 3, etc., of the tabernacle; 1 Kings vi. 5, etc., of the temple; properly "a palace," Amos viii. 3: דְּבִיר, of the most holy place in the tabernacle, Ps. xxviii. 2; and of that in the temple, 1 Kings vi. 5, 16, etc.: צוּם, "to fast," Judg. xx.

26 (comp. § 15, Note 5): יִשָּׂאֵל בִּיהוּדָה, Judg. i. 1, xx. 23, 27, etc.: קִטֵּר (*Piel*), "to burn incense," 1 Sam. ii. 16, Hos. iv. 13, 1 Kings xxii. 44, etc.; whereas in the Pentateuch we find only *Hiphil*, which afterwards maintains its ground along with *Piel* [see towards the end of Note 3, B.].

Add to these a great number of words in the books of Samuel, with which we do not previously meet in prose, chiefly belonging to poetical and prophetical language, like אָנַשׁ, "to be sickly," 2 Sam. xii. 15; comp. Job xxxiv. 6, Isa. xvii. 11, etc., and its derivative אֱנוֹשׁ, in Deut. xxxii. 26 first, then very often in Psalms and Job: בָּעַת, "to scare," 1 Sam. xvi. 14, 15; comp. 2 Sam. xxii. 5, Isa. xxi. 4, and often in Job: בָּרָה, "to eat," 2 Sam. iii. 35, xii. 17, etc., and בְּרִיָּה, "food," 2 Sam. xiii. 5, 7, 10; comp. בָּרוֹת, Ps. lxix. 22, and בָּרוֹת, Lam. iv. 10: בָּשַׂר, "to bring good news," 1 Sam. iv. 17, xxxi. 9, etc., and בְּשֹׂרָה, 2 Sam. iv. 10, xviii. 20, etc.; comp. the verb, Isa. xl. 9, etc.: חָפָה, "to cover," 2 Sam. xv. 30, Ps. lxviii. 14, Isa. iv. 5, Jer. xiv. 3, 4, Esth. vi. 12, vii. 8 ("to veil"), and 2 Chron. iii. 5 ff. ("to overlay" with gold, etc.); and the derivative חֻפָּה, "canopied couch, bridal bed," Ps. xix. 6, Joel ii. 16: טוּל (in *Hiphil*), "to cast down or forth," 1 Sam. xviii. 11, xx. 33; comp. Ps. xxxvii. 24, Prov. xvi. 33, etc.: יָעַל (*Hiphil* verb), "to profit," 1 Sam. xii. 21; comp. Prov. x. 2, xi. 4, and in Job and the prophets very often (in the Pentateuch there is only the word בְּלִיַּעַל, Deut. xiii. 14, xv. 9, which occurs elsewhere also): נָגַר, "to pour or stream out," 2 Sam. xiv. 14, Ps. lxxv. 9, Mic. i. 4, etc.: עָלַץ, "to exult," 1 Sam. ii. 1, Ps. v. 12, ix. 3, etc., and עָלַז, 2 Sam. i. 20, Ps. xxviii. 7, lx. 8, etc., Isa. xxiii. 12; עָלֵז, Isa. v. 14, and עָלִיז, Isa. xiii. 3, etc.; also עָלַם, Prov. vii. 18, Job xx. 18, xxxix. 13: פּוּקָה, "staggering," 1 Sam. xxv. 31; comp. פּוּק, Isa. xxviii. 7, Jer. x. 4, and פִּיק, Nah. ii. 11: קָשַׁב (in *Hiphil*), 1 Sam. xv. 22, elsewhere only by the prophets (including 2 Chron. xx. 15) and poets, except once in prose, 2 Chron. xxxiii. 10, as once in *Kal*, Isa. xxxii. 3; whence קֶשֶׁב, 1 Kings xviii. 29, 2 Kings iv. 31, Isa. xxi. 7: רָעַם (in *Hiphil*), "to thunder," 1 Sam. ii. 10, vii. 10, etc.; "to rouse, to irritate," 1 Sam. i. 6; then also in *Kal*, "to roar," of the sea, Ps. xcvi. 11, xcviii. 7, 1 Chron. xvi. 32; and רַעַם, "roaring" [Eng. ver. "the thunder" of the captains], Job xxxix. 25; "thunder," Ps. lxxvii. 19, etc. (which in the Pentateuch is קוֹלוֹת, Ex. ix. 23, 29, 33, xix. 19 [and elsewhere, 1 Sam. xii. 18]: and other words besides. To this class belongs also the use of שַׁדַּי, "The Almighty," Ruth i. 20, 21; הָגָה, "to meditate," Josh. i. 8 (comp. הֶגֶה, Ps. xc. 9), etc. Concerning the poetical colouring of the style of Joshua, Judges, Ruth, and Samuel, comp. *Häv.* Einl. i. 1, pp. 208 and 221.

The language attained to its highest degree of cultivation, however, in connection with the poetry which flourished gloriously under David and Solomon. Then for the first time it rightly developed the wealth and extent of its vocabulary, and also its intellectual force, and its capacity of assuming various forms for the expression of the most varied conceptions (3).

(3) It is true that the stamina of lyric poetry exist in the poetical portions of the Pentateuch: comp. for instance, אָתָה, "to come," Deut. xxxiii. 2, 21; זִמְרָה, "praise, psalm," Ex. xv. 2; יָהּ = יְהוָה, Ex. xv. 2, xvii. 16; שַׁדַּי, Gen. xlix. 25; הוֹפִיעַ, "to shine forth," Deut. xxxiii. 2; לֶקַח, "doctrine," Deut. xxxii. 2; מוּסָר, "instruction, chastisement," Deut. xi. 2; תַּהְפֻּכֹת, "perversity," Deut. xxxii. 20; תֵּבֵל, "world," Ps. xc. 2, etc. Yet the language became enlarged, enriched, and modified to such an important extent, by cultivation subsequent to the age of Moses, that a multitude of new roots, forms, and meanings come into view for the first time; though of course some of these may have been in use sooner, of which we have no trace, on account of the limited extent of the sources of information to which we now have access. Such are—

A. *Roots and words*:—אָוִיל, "foolish," Job v. 2, 3, Prov. vii. 22, and very often; אִוֶּלֶת, Prov. v. 23, etc.; as also פֶּתִי, Prov. i. 4, 22, etc., and in the Psalms too; and כְּסִיל and כֶּסֶל (comp. § 15, Note 6): אָטַם, "to stop" the ear, Prov. xvii. 28, Ps. lviii. 5, Isa. xxxiii. 15; "to close" a window, 1 Kings vi. 4, Ezek. xl. 16, etc.: אָמַלַּל, "to wither," 1 Sam. ii. 5, Ps. vi. 3, etc.: אָפַף, "to surround," Ps. xviii. 5, etc.: אָפִיק, "bed of a river," Ps. xviii. 16, xlii. 2, Job vi. 15, etc.: בּוּס, "to trample," Ps. xliv. 6, lx. 14, Prov. xxvii. 7, etc.; מְבוּסָה, Isa. xviii. 2, 7, xxii. 5, and תִּבוּסָה, 2 Chron. xxii. 7; בַּל, Ps. x. 4, 6, etc.: בַּלָּהָה, "terror," Ps. lxxiii. 19, Job xviii. 11, 14, etc.: בָּרַר, "to select, purify," Job xxxiii. 3, Ps. xviii. 27, etc.; בּוֹר, "purity," Ps. xviii. 21, etc.: גִּיל, "to exult," Ps. ii. 11, ix. 15, and very often; also as a noun, Ps. xlv. 16, etc.; and גִּילָה, Isa. xxxv. 2, lxv. 18: גָּעַשׁ, "to be shaken, to stagger," Ps. xviii. 8, Job xxxiv. 20, Jer. v. 22, etc.: דָּחָה, "to thrust," Ps. xxxv. 5, etc.; דֶּחִי, Ps. lvi. 14, cxvi. 8, and מִדְחֶה, Prov. xxvi. 28, derivative nouns: הֲגִיג, "sigh," Ps. v. 2, xxxix. 4; הָגוּת, Ps. xlix. 4; הֲגָיוֹן, Ps. ix. 17, etc.: הָגָה (= יָגָה, 2 Sam. xx. 13), "to remove," Prov. xxv. 4, 5, Isa. xxvii. 8: הוֹן, "wealth, resources," Ps. xliv. 13, Cant. viii. 7, Prov. i. 13, etc. (in the Pentateuch only the *Hiphil* verb, "to act with levity," Deut i. 41): הָלַם, "to smite," Judg. v. 22, 26, Ps. lxxiv. 6, Isa. xxviii. 1, etc.; הַלְמוּת, "mallet," Judg. v. 26, and מַהֲלֻמוֹת, "strokes," Prov. xviii. 6, xix. 29 (in the Pentateuch only

יָהֲלֹם, some precious stone, Ex. xxviii. 13 [?], 18, xxxix. 11): הָמָה, "to hum, to make a confused noise," Ps. lv. 18, xlvi. 4, etc., 1 Kings i. 41, Isa. xvi. 11, etc.: זָנַח, "to be putrid, to reject with loathing," Ps. xliii. 2, etc., Hos. viii. 3, 5, etc.: חָוָה, "to declare," Ps. xix. 3, Job xv. 17, etc.; אַתָּוָה, Job xiii. 17: חָזִיז, "flash of lightning," Job xxviii. 26, xxxviii. 25, Zech. x. 1: חָכָה, "to wait for," Ps. xxxiii. 20, Job iii. 21, Hos. vi. 9, etc.: חֹסֶן, "treasure," Prov. xv. 6, xxvii. 24, Isa. xxxiii. 6, etc.; חָסַן, Isa. xxiii. 18; חָסוֹן, "powerful," Isa. i. 31, Amos ii. 9; חֲסִין, Ps. lxxxix. 9: חָפַר, "to blush," Ps. xxxv. 4, 26, etc., Job vi. 20, Prov. xiii. 5, Isa. i. 29, etc.: יָשִׁישׁ, "hoary," Job xii. 12: כַּבִּיר, "strong," Job viii. 2, etc., Isa. x. 13, etc.; הִכְבִּיר, "to increase," Job xxxv. 16, xxxvi. 31 (comp. כִּבְרַת הָאָרֶץ, Gen. xxxv. 16, xlviii. 7, 2 Kings v. 19; and the later word כְּבָר, "long ago," Eccles. i. 10, etc.): כִּנָּה, "to address kindly," Isa. xliv. 5, xlv. 4, Job xxxii. 21, 22: לוּט, "to turn aside," Prov. iii. 21, etc.; נָלוֹז, "perverse," Prov. iii. 32, Isa. xxx. 12, etc.: לוּץ, "to mock;" לֵץ, "mocker," Ps. i. 1, Prov. ix. 7, 12, etc. (earlier only מֵלִיץ, "interpreter," Gen. xlii. 23; comp. Job xxxiii. 23, Isa. xliii. 27): נָגַהּ, "to be brilliant," Ps. xviii. 29, Job xviii. 5, etc.; נֹגַהּ, "brilliancy," Ps. xviii. 13, 2 Sam. xxiii. 4, Prov. iv. 18, and often in the prophets: נוּם, "to fall asleep, to sleep," Ps. lxxvi. 6, Isa. v. 27; נוּמָה, Prov. xxiii. 21; תְּנוּמָה, Prov. vi. 4, 10, etc.: נָחַת, "to descend," Ps. xviii. 35, etc.; נַחַת, Job xvii. 16, etc.: מְנַצֵּחַ, "leader of music," Ps. iv. 1, etc.; נֶצַח, "constancy, continuance," Ps. ix. 7, 19, etc., also already 2 Sam. ii. 26 (and 1 Sam. xv. 29, used of God in the sense of *fiducia*): נָתִיב, "path," Judg. v. 6, Prov. i. 15, etc.: סוּג, "to withdraw," Ps. xxxv. 4, etc. (also שׂוּג, 2 Sam. i. 22): סִיג, "dross," Prov. xxv. 4, xxvi. 23, Isa. i. 22, 25, etc.: סַעַר, "storm," Ps. lv. 9, lxxxiii. 16; סַעֲרָה, Job xxxviii. 1, xl. 6 (both with greater frequency when we come to the prophets, by whom also the verb is first employed): עָוַת, "to twist, bend," Job viii. 3, xix. 6, and often afterwards: עָצַל, "to be slothful," Judg. xviii. 9; עָצֵל, Prov. vi. 6, 9; עַצְלוּת, Prov. xxxi. 27; עַצְלָה, Prov. xix. 15; פָּזַר, "to scatter," Ps. liii. 6, Prov. xi. 24, etc.: פֶּלֶג, "stream," Judg. v. 15, 16, Ps. i. 3, Prov. v. 16, Isa. xxx. 25, etc.: פָּלַס, "to level, to weigh," Prov. iv. 26, Ps. lviii. 3, etc.; פֶּלֶס, "a balance," Prov. xvi. 11, Isa. xl. 12: הִתְפַּלֵּץ, "to be agitated;" פַּלְצוּת, "agitation of mind," Ps. lv. 6, Job xxi. 6, Isa. xxi. 4, Ezek. vii. 18: קָדַר, "to be black, dark," Ps. xxxv. 14, Job v. 11, etc.; קְדֵרוּת, "blackness," Isa. l. 3: רָעַשׁ, "to be moved, to heave," Judg. v. 4, Ps. xviii. 8, etc.; רַעַשׁ, Job xxxix. 24, 1 Kings xix. 11, 12, and often in the prophets: רָצַף, "to cushion, to quilt," Cant. iii. 10; רִצְפָּה, "pavement," Ezek. xl. 18, 27 [? 17], etc.; מַרְצֶפֶת, the same, 2 Kings xvi. 17: שָׂגָא, "to be great," Ps. lxxiii.

12, Job xii. 23, etc. (also שְׁנָה, Ps. xcii. 13, Job viii. 7, 11); שַׁגְיָא, Job xxxvi. 26, xxxvii. 23: שָׁאַף, "to snort, breathe fiercely," Ps. lvi. 3, lvii. 4, Job vii. 2, etc.: שָׁבַח, "to praise," Ps. lxiii. 4, lxv. 8 [*Hiph.*], Prov. xxix. 11, etc.: שָׁדַד, "to lay waste," Judg. v. 27, Ps. xvii. 9, etc., especially in the prophets; שׁוֹר, Ps. xii. 6, Job v. 21, etc.: שָׁוָה, "to resemble," Prov. iii. 15, Ps. xviii. 34, etc.: שׁוּחַ, "to sink," Ps. xliv. 26, Prov. ii. 18, Lam. iii. 20; שׁוּחָה and שַׁחַת, "pit," Ps. xvi. 10, Prov. xxii. 14, etc.: שׁוּעַ, "wealthy," Job xxxiv. 19, Isa. xxxii. 5; שׁוּעַ, "wealth," Job xxxvi. 19: שָׁחַח, "to be pressed, bowed down," Ps. x. 6, xlii. 6, Prov. xii. 25 [שָׁחָה], Isa. ii. 9, etc.: שַׁחַל, "the roarer," = the lion, Job iv. 10, etc., Prov. xxvi. 13, Ps. xci. 13, Hos. v. 14; and לַיִשׁ, "the strong one," = the lion, Job iv. 11, Prov. xxx. 30, Isa. xxx. 6 (both words being added to another, לָבִיא, Gen. xlix. 9, etc., which is also purely poetical): שִׁחֵר [*Piel*], "to seek eagerly," Prov. i. 28, Ps. lxiii. 2, etc.: שַׁי, "a present, gift," Ps. lxviii. 30, lxxvi. 12, Isa. xviii. 7: שָׁפַת, "to set or place," Ps. xxii. 16, Isa. xxvi. 12: שְׁעְשַׁע, "to be delighted with, to caress," Ps. xciv. 19, Isa. xi. 8, etc.; שַׁעֲשׁוּעִים, Prov. viii. 30, 31, Isa. v. 7, etc.: שָׁתַל, "to plant," Ps. i. 3, Hos. ix. 13, etc.; שְׁתִיל "slip, plant," Ps. cxxviii. 3: and other words besides.

B. *Forms and formations of words*:—אֲבַדּוֹן, "destruction," Prov. xv. 11, Ps. lxxxviii. 12, Job xxvi. 6, etc.: אֹפֶל, "darkness," Ps. xi. 2, Job iii. 6, Isa. xxix. 18 (along with אֲפֵלָה, which alone was earlier in use, Ex. x. 22, Deut. xxviii. 29): זִמֵּר, "to sing praise," Judg. v. 3, Ps. vii. 18, etc.; מִזְמוֹר, Ps. iii. 1, etc.: מְזִמָּה, "thought," Ps. x. 2, 4, etc.: מַחֲוֶה, "refuge," Ps. xiv. 6, xlvi. 2, Job xxiv. 8, etc.: תַּחֲנוּנִים, "supplications," Ps. xxviii. 2, 6, etc.: חָכְמוֹת, "Supreme Wisdom," Prov. i. 20, etc.: תְּבוּנוֹת, "discernment," Ps. xlix. 4, Prov. xi. 12, etc.; תַּחְבֻּלוֹת, "guidance," Prov. i. 5, etc.; תּוֹכַחַת, "reproof, castigation," Prov. i. 23, 25, etc.: תּוּשִׁיָּה, "welfare, salvation," Prov. ii. 7, etc.: מָדוֹן, "strife," Ps. lxxx. 7, Prov. xv. 18, etc.; along with the forms occurring in Prov. alone, מְדָנִים, ch. xviii. 18, etc., and מָדָנִים, ch. vi. 14, 19, x. 12: צֶאֱצָאִים, "shoots," Job v. 25, xxi. 8, Isa. xxii. 24, etc. (only in Job and Isa.): קוּט, "to feel weariness, disgust," Job viii. 14, x. 1, and often in later writers (along with קוּץ, which alone was in earlier use, Lev. xx. 23, etc.): הֵקִיץ, "to awake," Ps. iii. 6, xvii. 15, and very often (instead of the earlier יָקַץ, Gen. ix. 24, etc., which we find only in Ps. lxxviii. 65 and 1 Kings iii. 15, xviii. 27): קִטֵּר (*Piel*), from 1 Sam. ii. 16 and onwards, very frequently along with the *Hiphil* (which alone was in earlier use, Ex. xxix. 13, Lev. i. 9, etc.): קֶרֶת, "city," Prov. viii. 3, etc., for קִרְיָה: שְׁאוֹן, "tumult," Ps. xl. 3, lxv. 8, Isa. v. 14, etc.: שֹׁאָה, "crash," "ruin," Prov. iii. 25,

Ps. xxxv. 8, etc.: and many other words peculiar to Psalms, Proverbs, and Job.

C. *Words in derivative significations*, which furnish evidence that the language was continually developing:—זִמָּה, in a wide sense "wickedness," Ps. xxvi. 10, or "counsel," Job xvii. 11, Prov. xxi. 27, xxiv. 9 (in the Pentateuch only of the sin of unchastity): חָרַץ, "to decide," Isa. x. 22, 23, 1 Kings xx. 40, etc. (see § 15, Note 6): חָרוּץ, 1*st*, "gold," Prov. iii. 14, viii. 10, etc.; 2*d*, "threshing-cart," Job xli. 22, Isa. xli. 15; 3*d*, "diligent," etc., Prov. x. 4, etc. (the verb, 2 Sam. v. 24): חָרַשׁ, "to contrive" evil, 1 Sam. xxiii. 9, Prov. iii. 29, etc. (in the Pentateuch only "to be an artificer," Gen. iv. 22, Ex. xxviii. 11, etc.): כֶּתֶם, "gold," Cant. v. 11, Ps. xlv. 10; and פָּז, "gold," Ps. xix. 11, xxi. 4; etc.; comp. זָהָב מוּפָז, 1 Kings x. 18, מֵאוּפָז, Jer. x. 9, and כֶּתֶם אוּפָז, Dan. x. 5: נָבַע (*Hiphil*), "to bubble," metaphorically, Ps. xix. 3, Prov. i. 23, etc.: פָּרַע, "to reject, slight," Prov. i. 25, etc. (in the Pentateuch still in the primary sensuous meaning, "to make bare," Lev. x. 6, and, in *Hiphil*, "to let loose" from labour, Ex. v. 4, or from all restraints, Ex. xxxii. 25): מַשְׁבִּית, "imagination," Prov. xviii. 11, Ps. lxxiii. 7 (at an earlier time, only "carving" of wood or stone, Lev. xxvi. 1, Num. xxxiii. 52): שָׁטָה, "to indulge, to run to excess" (in the Pentateuch only of adultery, Num. v. 12, 19, 20, 29); later, in a general sense, "to turn aside," Prov. iv. 15, vii. 25: and other words besides.

Prophecy, too, which from the time of Samuel exerted a powerful influence on the course of the theocracy, contributed to the further cultivation of the language; although no evidence that its domain was much extended or enriched is furnished by the prophetic literature which begins in the ninth century (4). The influence of prophecy upon the language is revealed principally by the cultivation of an oratorical style, which in the older prophets (that is, till Isaiah) more or less approaches to lyric poetry, sometimes passing into it entirely, and harmoniously blending poetry and prose for the euphonious, powerful, and imaginative expression of the divine truths announced by the prophets. This result is attained through that rhythm in the structure of members and strophes which is common to poetry and to the artificial prophetic discourse (5).

(4) There is no perceptible difference of any importance between the vocabulary of the poetical books and that of the older prophets.

In the prophetic predictions indeed, which touch upon the most various relations of nature and of life, many words occur which have not been previously mentioned. Thus, along with אַרְבֶּה, Ex. x. 4, Joel. i. 4, etc., there are other words for "locust:" גָּזָם, Joel i. 4, ii. 25, Amos iv. 9; יֶלֶק, Joel i. 4, Nah. iii. 15, etc., also in Ps. cv. 34, which belongs to the age of the exile [see, however, additional observations as to the age of this and other psalms in § 113]; and חָסִיל, Joel i. 4, Isa. xxxiii. 4 (חָסַל already in Deut. xxviii. 38). Along with אֶפְעֶה, Job xx. 16, Isa. xxx. 6, lix. 5, for "snake," there is also צֶפַע, Isa. xiv. 29, and צִפְעֹנִי, Isa. xi. 8, lix. 5, Jer. viii. 17, etc., also Prov. xxiii. 32: מְלוּנָה, "a keeper's hut," Isa. i. 8, xxiv. 20: מַפֵּלָה, "a ruin," Isa. xxiii. 13, xxv. 2, and מַפָּלָה, Isa. xvii. 1; along with מַפֶּלֶת, "fall," Prov. xxix. 16, Ezek. xxvi. 15, etc. (in Judg. xiv. 8, "a carcase"): נֵצֶר, "a branch, a twig," Isa. xi. 1, xiv. 19, Dan. xi. 7: קִפּוֹד, "hedgehog," Isa. xiv. 23, xxxiv. 11, Zeph. ii. 14: שָׁמִיר וָשַׁיִת, "thorns and thistles," Isa. v. 6, vii. 23–25, etc. Nevertheless, such words are no more to be reckoned characteristic of a particular age of the language, than are the ἅπαξ λεγόμενα and peculiar expressions of individual prophets. Those only can be so reckoned which probably came into use for the first time after the age of David and Solomon, as אִכָּר, "tiller of the ground," Joel i. 11, Amos v. 16, etc.: אַרְמוֹן, "palace," Amos i. 4, 12, Ps. xlviii. 4 (a later psalm of the sons of Korah), 1 Kings xvi. 18, etc.: בַּת, a measure of capacity, Isa. v. 10, 1 Kings vii. 26, etc.: גָּאַל, "to defile," Isa. lix. 3, lxiii. 3, etc.: גָּנַן, "to cover, to protect," Isa. xxxi. 5, xxxvii. 35, etc.: חֹרִים, "nobles," Isa. xxxiv. 12, 1 Kings xxi. 8, 11, etc.: יְהוּדִי, "a Jew," Isa. xxxvi. 11, 13, 2 Kings xvi. 6, etc.: מַשָּׂא, "divine utterance" [probably better, as Eng. version, "burden;" though no doubt applied in a peculiar sense to a prophetic utterance], Isa. xiii. 1, etc., 2 Kings ix. 25, Prov. xxx. 1: הִטִּיף, "to drop" a prophecy, Mic. ii. 6, 11, Amos vii. 16, Ezek. xxi. 2, 7: סָגַד, "to worship" idols, Isa. xliv. 15, 17, 19, xlvi. 6; סוּף, "to cease," Isa. lxvi. 17, Amos iii. 15, etc.; סוֹף, "rear" of an army, Joel ii. 20; "end," 2 Chron. xx. 16, etc.: the foreign words, סְגָנִים, "satraps," Isa. xli. 25, Jer. li. 28, etc.; פֶּחָה, "vicegerent, lieutenant," Isa. xxxvi. 9, 1 Kings xx. 24, etc.

(5) The predictions of the older prophets are peculiarly rich in metaphor, paronomasia, and play upon words; in which a progress in the intellectual development of the language cannot but be noticed. See the collection of examples in *Knobel*, der Prophetismus, i. p. 366 ff., 405 ff.

The Hebrew language attained to this wealth, which was dis-

played in the poetic and prophetic literature, partly through the increase of its roots and its formations of words, according to its own laws for making these (§ 10); partly through the adoption of words and forms from the kindred Aramaic and Arabic dialects. This latter class of words, of course, belonged to the common Shemitic language: yet they had been retained, as expressions in common use for certain conceptions, only by one or other of the branches into which the race became divided; and they had remained unobserved by the Hebrews, until they were again appropriated, under the influence of increasing civilisation and more and more varied development of intellectual life (6).

(6) In reference to the Chaldaisms, as they are styled, of the older Hebrew literature, comp. *Hirzel*, de Chaldaismi bibl. orig. et auctor. crit. comment., where four kinds are distinguished:—*A*. Some whose source is to be traced back to the relationship of Hebrew and Chaldee. *B*. Certain peculiarities of the vulgar, as שׁ for the relative pronoun in Judges; הָאּ for הִנֵּה, Gen. xlvii. 23, etc. *C*. Words and forms which poets have borrowed from a foreign language, "either according to the common disposition of all poetical language, to despise expressions which are in common use, to preserve those which are rarer and more antique, and finally to introduce others from a foreign source; or admitting foreign words and forms in place of those which are most in use, for the sake of the rhythm, especially any which are more sonorous at the end of sentences; or finally, since the law of parallelism made the several synonymous words of the several clauses answer to one another, either perhaps the Hebrew language did not furnish a sufficient variety from which to select, or what it did furnish was rejected by the writer, who was thus compelled to have recourse to a foreign word" (*Hirzel*, p. 10 sqq.). *D*. Words introduced in the speeches of Aramæans; for instance, Gen. xxxi. 49 [? 47].

§ 17. *The Language of the Age of the Exile.*

In connection with the Assyrian invasions, the Aramaic dialect began to spread in Palestine, and to exercise an immediate influence, in the way of restraint, upon the continued independent development of the Hebrew language. This was the introduction to its gradual decay; which did not become fully manifest, however, until the commencement of the Chaldean period (1).

(1) Consequently the prophecies of Nahum and Habakkuk are still to be reckoned to the former period, in respect of the spirit and form of the language. It is Zephaniah first who makes the transition to the period of the exile; and already Jeremiah shows everywhere very strong traces of the decay of the language. The degeneracy becomes still greater in Ezekiel. On the contrary, the three prophets subsequent to the exile have made a tolerably pure Hebrew style of their own, by diligently studying the older sacred writings. The psalms of the exile and of a later period have also kept pretty free of glaring Aramaisms and corruptions in the language, by studying more ancient models, and moving in familiar tracks which were formed in an age of earlier cultivation; whereas in Ecclesiastes there is no denying the entire decay of a language which is in the act of expiring, in spite of much in it that goes back upon the composition of proverbs which we find in Solomon. [See, however, the additions on Ecclesiastes, § 130.] Finally, among the historical writings, the books of Kings have very faithfully preserved the purer and better language of sources of information older than themselves. On the contrary, Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther, manifest the corrupting influence of the Aramaic in all directions.

Not only did the intrusion of this powerful Aramaic element greatly tarnish the purity of the Hebrew words and their grammatical formation, older ones having been altered and supplanted by newer ones which are Aramaic for the most part (2): it also obscured the understanding of the old language (3); and it enfeebled its instinctive operations, until at length it stifled them. In consequence of this, the capacity of observing grammatical niceties in the old pure Hebrew was entirely lost (4); partly the distinction of prose and poetical diction was forgotten; and finally, as the later writers went back upon the Pentateuch and other older compositions, many elements which had already died out of the language were reproduced as archaisms (6).

(2) This is seen in the coining of new words for abstract ideas by means of prefixed letters or syllables added. [On this subject there is need for speaking with considerable caution. Our own language is at present adopting certain German grammatical characteristics, which have been long almost or entirely out of use, which did, however, belong to it at an earlier period, when German and English had not yet diverged so far as they afterwards did; for instance, the composition of two nouns into a single word by mere juxtaposition. So there

are older forms which have been disused on account of their greater length or comparative clumsiness; compare joyfulness and joy, unloose and loose.] Such are תַּגְמוּל for גְּמוּל, "requital," Ps. cxvi. 12; תַּזְנוּת for זְנוּת, "whoredom," Ezek. xvi. 15, 20; תַּלְמִיד, "scholar," 1 Chron. xxv. 8, for לָמוּד, Isa. liv. 13; תַּעֲנִית, "fasting," Ezra ix. 5; מַאֲמָר for אֹמֶר, "word, command," Esth. i. 15, ii. 20, ix. 32; מְדָרָשׁ, "investigation," 2 Chron. xiii. 22, xxiv. 27; מִרְשָׁעַת for רִשְׁעָה or רִשְׁעַ, "wickedness," 2 Chron. xxiv. 7; בִּרִית for בֹּר, "alkaline salt," Jer. ii. 22, Mal. iii. 2; חִתִּית for חַת, "terror," Ezek. xxxii. 17 [?], 23 ff.; בִּזָּה for בַּז, "booty," 2 Chron. xiv. 13, xxv. 13, Ezra ix. 7, Neh. iii. 36, Esth. ix. 10, etc.; צוּרָה, "figure," Ezek. xliii. 11, for צִיר, Isa. xlv. 16; אוֹרָה, "light, welfare," Ps. cxxxix. 12, Esth. viii. 16; הֲמֻלָּה, "tumultuous noise," Jer. xi. 16, Ezek. i. 24, for הָמוֹן; בִּנְיָה and בִּנְיָן for בַּיִת, "building," Ezek. xl. 5, xli. 12, 13, 15, etc.; אַבְדָן, "slaughter," Esth. ix. 5, and אָבְדָן, "ruin," Esth. viii. 6; עִנְיָן, "labour, trouble," Eccles. i. 13, ii. 23, 26, etc.; רַחֲמָנִי for רחוּם, "merciful," Lam. iv. 10; קִדְרַנִּית for קֹדֶר, "mourning," Mal. iii. 14; מְרִירוּת for מָרָה, "bitter sorrow," Ezek. xxi. 11, comp. 2 Sam. ii. 26, Prov. xiv. 10; סִכְלוּת, "folly," Eccles. ii. 3, 12, etc., along with סֵכֶל, Eccles. x. 6; עַבְדוּת, "servitude," Ezra ix. 8, 9, Neh. ix. 17; רַעְיוֹת, "endeavour," Eccles. i. 14, ii. 11, 17, etc.; חֶסְרוֹן, "want," Eccles. i. 15, for חֶסֶר, Prov. xxviii. 22, Job xxx. 3; חֶשְׁבּוֹן, "insight, reason," Eccles. vii. 25, 27, ix. 10; חִשְׁבֹּנוֹת, "inventions," Eccles. vii. 29, "military engines," 2 Chron. xxvi. 15; יִתְרוֹן, "profit," Eccles. i. 3, ii. 11, etc.; כִּשְׁרוֹן, "prosperity," Eccles. ii. 21, iv. 4, v. 10; עִזְבוֹן, "letting go," in the plural "wares," Ezek. xxvii. 12, 14; רַעְיוֹן, "endeavour." Eccles. i. 17, ii. 12 [?], iv. 16; רִשְׁיוֹן, "authorization, permission," Ezra iii. 7; שִׁכָּרוֹן, "drunkenness," Ezek. xxiii. 33, xxxix. 19; שִׁלְטוֹן, "dominion," Eccles. viii. 4, 8. Besides, the thoroughly Chaldaizing formations, בַּקָּשָׁה, "desire, request," Ezra vii. 6, Esth. v. 3, 7, 8; הַצָּלָה, "deliverance," Esth. iv. 14 (comp. the Chaldee infinitive, Dan. iii. 29); מַקָּח, "the taking," 2 Chron. xix. 7; מְדָע = יֵדַע, "knowledge," 2 Chron. i. 10–12, Dan. i. 4, 17, Eccles. x. 20 (comp. the Chaldee מַנְדַּע, Dan. ii. 21, etc.); מָבוֹא = בּאָה, "entrance," Ezek. viii. 5; יְנִיקָה = יוֹנֵק, "twig," Ezek. xvii. 4; סְלִיחָה, "forgiveness," Neh. ix. 9 [?], 17, Ps. cxxx. 4; and others which might be added.

A number of words must also be included here, partly belonging to the later Hebrew, partly taken from the Chaldee, and not to be sharply separated in respect of their origin: as אֲגַפִּים, "forces, army," Ezek. xii. 14, xvii. 21, xxxviii. 6, 9, 22, xxxix. 4 (comp. the Chaldee אֲגַף, "wing" of a bird or of an army): אִגֶּרֶת, "letter" (instead of the older סְפָרִים), 2 Chron. xxx. 1, 6, Neh. ii. 7–9, etc. (in Chald. אִגְּרָא, Ezra iv. 8, etc.): אזן [*Piel*] = שָׁקַל, "to weigh," Eccles. xii. 9: אַחֲלֵי,

"O that," Ps. cxix. 5; and אַחֲלֵי, 2 Kings v. 3: אִלּוּ, "although," Eccles. vi. 6, Esth. vii. 4: אָנַס, "to urge," Esth. i. 8 (Chald. אֲנַס, Dan. iv. 6): אָנַק, "to howl, groan," as a verb first in Jer. li. 52, Ezek. ix. 4, etc.; the noun אֲנָקָה, so early as Ps. xii. 6, etc.; comp. Lev. xi. 30: בָּדָא, "to feign, invent," 1 Kings xii. 33, Neh. vi. 8: בֶּדֶק, "rent" in a building, 2 Kings xii. 6–9, Ezek. xxvii. 9, etc.; and the denominative verb בָּדַק, "to repair a rent," 2 Chron. xxxiv. 10: בָּטַל, "to cease," Eccles. xii. 3: בּוּץ for שֵׁשׁ, "byssus," 1 Chron. xv. 27, 2 Chron. ii. 13, etc.: בִּירָה, "castle, palace," 1 Chron. xxix. 1, 19, Neh. i. 1, ii. 8, etc.: גּוּמִּין, "ditch," Eccles. x. 8: גִּנָּז, "treasure," Esth. iii. 9, iv. 7, Ezek. xxvii. 24; and גִּנְזָךְ, "treasury," 1 Chron. xxviii. 11: גּוּפָה, "dead body," 1 Chron. x. 12, for גְּוִיָּה, 1 Sam. xxxi. 12; גָּאַל, "to pollute" (softened from גָּעַל), Ezra ii. 62, Neh. vii. 64, Mal. i. 7, etc., poetically already in Isa. lix. 3, lxiii. 3: גָּרַם, "to wear down," Ps. cxix. 20, Lam. iii. 16; comp. גָּרַשׂ, Lev. ii. 14, 16: דַּיִק, "watch-tower," 2 Kings xxv. 1, Ezek. iv. 2, etc.; דָּחַף, "to thrust," 2 Chron. xxvi. 20, Esth. iii. 15, etc.; and מַדְחֵפָה, Ps. cxl. 12: זָוִית, "corner," Zech. ix. 15; and זָן = מִין, "species," 2 Chron. xvi. 14 (both already as poetical Chaldaisms, Ps. cxliv. 12, 13): זְמָן, "season," Eccles. iii. 1, Neh. ii. 6, Esth. ix. 27, 31; and זִמֵּן [*Piel*], "to fix a time," Ezra x. 14, Neh. x. 35, xiii. 31: חֲבָל, "a pledge," Ezek. xviii. 12, 16, xxxiii. 5; and חֲבָלָה, Ezek. xviii. 7: הִתְיַחֵשׂ, "to be enrolled in the genealogies," instead of the older הִתְיַלֵּד (§ 15, Note 2), 1 Chron. iv. 33, v. 1, etc.; יָשַׁט [only in *Hiphil*], "to extend," Esth. iv. 11, v. 2, viii. 4; חֹרִים, "nobles," 1 Kings xxi. 8, Jer. xxvii. 20, etc.; earlier only of the Edomite nobility, Isa. xxxiv. 12: טָלַל = צָלַל, "to overshadow, to cover," Neh. iii. 15: טָעָה = תָּעָה, "to wander," Ezek. xiii. 10: כְּבָר, "long ago," Eccles. i. 10, ii. 12, etc.: כָּסַם = גָּזַז = גָּזַם, "to shear, clip," Ezek. xliv. 20: כָּשַׁר, "to be right," Eccles. x. 10, xi. 6, Esth. viii. 5 (earlier only poetically, בּוֹשָׂרוֹת, Ps. lxviii. 7): לָעַב (*Hiphil*), "to mock," 2 Chron. xxxvi. 16: לָעַז, "to speak a barbarous language," Ps. cxiv. 1: מְדִינָה, "province," 1 Kings xx. 14, 15, 17, Lam. i. 1, Ezek. xix. 8, etc.: נָסַק, "to ascend," Ps. cxxxix. 8: נִשְׁבָּה for לִשְׁכָּה, "cell, chamber," Neh. iii. 30, xii. 44, etc.: נְתִינִים, "temple-bondsmen," Ezra viii. 17, 20, Neh. iii. 31, etc.: סָחָה, "to sweep away," Ezek. xxvi. 4: סְחִי, "offscourings," Lam. iii. 45: סוֹף for קֵץ, "end," 2 Chron. xx. 16, Eccles. iii. 11, etc.: סוֹפֵר instead of the ancient שֹׁטֵר, Jer. xxxvii. 15, 2 Kings xxv. 19, etc.; and in the sense of "scribe," 1 Chron. xxvii. 32, Ezra vii. 6, etc.: עָנַב, "to love" impurely, Jer. iv. 30, Ezek. xxiii. 5, 7, etc.; עֲנָבָה, Ezek. xxiii. 11; עֲנָבִים, Ezek. xxxiii. 31, 32: עִזְרָה = חָצֵר, "court," 2 Chron. iv. 9, vi. 13, Ezek. xliii. 14, etc.: עָמַם ["to shut up," hence] "to darken," Lam. iv. 1, Ezek. xxviii. 3, xxxi. 8: פֶּלֶךְ, "circle, district," Neh. iii. 9, 12

ff.: עָתִּיד, "he-goat," 2 Chron. xxix. 21, Ezra viii. 34, Dan. viii. 5: צָרְךָ, "need," 2 Chron. ii. 15: קָבֶל, "before," 2 Kings xv. 10: קָרַם, "to overlay," Ezek. xxxvii. 6, 8: קָסַם = קָצַץ, "to cut off," Ezek. xvii. 9: רַב for שַׂר, 2 Kings xxv. 8, Dan. i. 3, Esth. i. 8, etc.: שׁוּט, "to despise, to disdain," Ezek. xvi. 57, xxviii. 24, 26; and שָׁאָט, Ezek. xxv. 6, xxxvi. 5: שָׁלַט, "to rule," Neh. v. 15, Eccles. v. 18, etc.; and שַׁלִּיט, Ezek. xvi. 30, Eccles. viii. 8 (earlier only of the ruler in Egypt, Gen. xlii. 6): תָּאַב, "to desire," Ps. cxix. 40, 174; and תַּאֲבָה, Ps. cxix. 20: תָּא, "chamber," 1 Kings xiv. 28, 2 Chron. xii. 11, Ezek. xl. 7, etc.: תָּקַן, "to be straight," Eccles. i. 15, vii. 13, xii. 9; and others besides. In addition, there are the Chaldee names of the months—נִיסָן, Neh. ii. 1, Esth. iii. 7; סִיוָן, Esth. viii. 9; זִו, 1 Kings vi. 1, 37; אֱלוּל, Neh. vi. 15; כִּסְלֵו, Neh. i. 1, Zech. vii. 1; טֵבֵת, Esth. ii. 16; שְׁבָט, Zech. i. 7; אֲדָר, Esth. iii. 7, 13, viii. 12, etc.: the measures—בַּת = an ephah, 1 Kings vii. 26, 38, 2 Chron. ii. 9, comp. Isa. v. 10; כֹּר, 1 Kings v. 2, 25, Ezek. xlv. 14, etc.; and many other technical terms, for official posts and the like, which forced their way in along with the Chaldee supremacy. [Probably not a few of these belong to the age of David and Solomon, and were introduced in connection with their dominion over the Syrians and kindred races as far as the Euphrates. See the additional remarks on Ecclesiastes.]

(3) This is shown by the increasing use of the *scriptio plena*, to make words be more easily understood, as דָּוִיד, יְרוּשָׁלַיִם [very rare]; יָצוּמוּ, 1 Chron. x. 12, for יָצֻמוּ, 1 Sam. xxxi. 13; יְקוּהִיאֵל, 2 Chron. v. 2, for יְקֻהֵל, 1 Kings viii. 1; and וְאָקוֹם, וְאָשִׁים, 2 Chron. vi. 10, 11, for וְאָקֵם and וְאָשֵׂם, 1 Kings viii. 20, 21, etc. (comp. *Keil*, apologet. Versuch ü. d. Chron. p. 32 ff.; *Movers*, d. bibl. Chron. p. 43 f., 200): the interchange of the weak letters ה and א—for instance, הִיךְ, 1 Chron. xiii. 12, for אֵיךְ, 2 Sam. vi. 9; מְקִוֵא, 2 Chron. i. 16, for מִקְוֵה, 1 Kings x. 28; חָפָא for חָפָה, 2 Kings xvii. 9; סָלָא for סָלָה [*Pual*], Lam. iv. 2: also in proper names, רַעְמָא, סַבְתָּא, 1 Chron. i. 9, for רַעְמָה, סַבְתָּה, Gen. x. 7; עָזָא for עָזָה, 1 Chron. xiii. 7, etc. (comp. *Keil*, *ibid.* p. 34 f.; *Movers*, p. 200 f.); אִישֵׁי, 1 Chron. ii. 13, for יִשַׁי, ver. 12, Ruth iv. 22: the resolution of the *Daghesh forte* in sharpened syllables, by inserting a vowel, as מוֹרִיגִים, 1 Chron. xxi. 23, for מֹרְגִים, 2 Sam. xxiv. 22; אִיתִי for אִתִּי, 1 Chron. xi. 31 and 2 Sam. xxiii. 29; אֲלַגּוּמִים, 2 Chron. ii. 7, ix. 11, for אַלְמֻגִּים, 1 Kings x. 11;—or by inserting a liquid, דִּרְמֶשֶׂק for דַּמֶּשֶׂק, 1 Chron. xviii. 5, 6; מְכִרְבָּל, "clothed" [perhaps more strictly, "girded"], 1 Chron. xv. 27; סִרְעָפָה, "twig," Ezek. xxxi. 5, along with סְעָפָה in vers. 6, 8, and סָעִיף, Isa. xvii. 6, xxvii. 10; שִׁרְבִיט, "sceptre," Esth. iv. 11, v. 2, viii. 4, for שֵׁבֶט. That the knowledge of the old language was dying out among the people,

is particularly made manifest by the way and manner in which Jeremiah and the Chronicler work up the old sources of information for their contemporaries, and replace old expressions, which had become obscure and difficult, by new ones which were easier and commonly in use. Comp. Jer. xlviii. 45, 46, with Num. xxi. 28, 29, xxiv. 17; and upon this see *Häv.* Einl. i. 1, p. 236; and as regards Chronicles, comp. the examples brought together in *Movers*, p. 202 ff., which, however, require to be critically sifted.

(4) Interchange of אֵת as marking the accusative, and as meaning "with:"—for instance, Jer. i. 16, xix. 10, xx. 11, etc. (comp. *Ewald*, ausführl. Lehrbuch, § 264): the use of לְ to mark the nearer instead of the more remote object, or the accusative instead of the dative, 1 Chron. v. 26, xvi. 37, xxix. 20, 22, 2 Chron. v. 11, xiv. 12, Ezra viii. 24, Neh. ix. 37, Jer. xl. 2, Lam. iii. 51, etc. (comp. *Ewald*, § 277, *e*): the use of עַל instead of אֶל, without any emphasis, Jer. xi. 2, xix. 5, xxv. 2, 1 Kings xvi. 7, etc., especially in the phrase אִם עַל־הַמֶּלֶךְ טוֹב, Neh. ii. 5, 7, Esth. i. 19, iii. 9, etc. (comp. *Ewald*, p. 489): the prolix accumulation of prepositions and adverbs—עַד־אֶל, 2 Kings ix. 20; עַד־לְ, 1 Kings xviii. 29, 1 Chron. xxviii. 7, 20, 2 Chron. xiv. 12, xvi. 14 (עַד לִמְאוֹד), Ezra iii. 13, etc.; לִפְנֵי מִזֶּה, Neh. xiii. 4; לְבַד עַל, Ezra i. 6; בְּפִתְאֹם, 2 Chron. xxix. 36; בְּמַהֲרָה, Eccles. iv. 12 [this is nothing else than our English phrase "*in* haste"]; בְּיוֹמָם, Neh. ix. 19; and others (comp. *Ewald*, § 315, *c*): mistakes in not distinguishing passive and reflexive forms, so that not only the latter come in place of the former, but also, conversely, passives assume reflexive meanings, and form imperatives, Jer. xlix. 8, Ezek. xxxii. 19 (comp. *Ewald*, § 226, *a*): the intrusion of Aramaic forms of inflection, etc., as אַתְּי for אַתְּ, Jer. iv. 30; תְּי for תָּ, Jer. ii. 33, iii. 4, 5, iv. 19, etc.; כִּי and ־כִי for ךָ, Jer. xi. 15, 2 Kings iv. 7, Ps. cxxxvii. 6; and entirely abnormal inflections, especially in Ezekiel, as ־יְהָא for ־יְהוָה, ch. xli. 15; ־א for ־ה, ch. xxxv. 5; ־יְהֶנָּה and ־יְהֶמָּה for ־יְהֶן and ־יְהֶם, ch. i. 11, xl. 16; ־הֶנָּה, ch. xvi. 53 (also 1 Kings vii. 37); בֶּנָּה, ch. xxiii. 48; אַתֶּנָּה, ch. xiii. 20: the verbal forms גְּבָהָא and קְרָחָא, Ezek. xxxi. 5, xxvii. 31 [is this latter a *verbal* form?]; יוֹכְלוּ from אָכַל, Ezek. xlii. 5; אֲבִידָה, Jer. xlvi. 8; נְבִיתָ for נְבֵאתָ, Jer. xxvi. 9; נוֹגִים for נוֹגִים, Zeph. iii. 18, Lam. i. 4; and others besides.

(5) Comp. בָּלַהּ [*Piel*], "to be afraid," Ezra iv. 4 (elsewhere only the substantive בַּלָּהָה in poetry): זָנַח, "to reject with loathing," 1 Chron. xxviii. 9, 2 Chron. xi. 14, xxix. 19 (earlier only in poets, and in Hos. viii. 3, 5, Zech. x. 6): יְשִׁישׁ, "hoary head," 2 Chron. xxxvi. 17 (elsewhere only יָשִׁישׁ, Job xii. 12, xv. 10, xxix. 8, and xxxii. 6): פִּזֵּר [*Piel*], "to scatter," Esth. iii. 8: שִׁבַּח [*Piel*], "to praise,"

Eccles. iv. 2, viii. 15: תָּקַף, "to overpower," Eccles. iv. 12, vi. 10 (earlier only Job xiv. 20, xv. 24); whence תֹּקֶף, Esth. ix. 29, x. 2, Dan. xi. 17, and תַּקִּיף, Eccles. vi. 10, Dan. ii. 40, etc.: קִבֵּל [*Piel*], "to accept what is offered," Prov. xix. 20, Job ii. 10; afterwards = לָקַח, "to take," 2 Chron. xxix. 16, 22, Ezra viii. 30, Esth. iv. 4, etc., like the Chaldee קַבֵּל, Dan. ii. 6, etc.: נִצַּח [*Piel*], in the general sense "to oversee," 2 Chron. ii. 1, 17, xxxiv. 12, 13 (comp. *Häv.* Einl. iii. p. 111): אֱלוֹהַּ, 2 Chron. xxxii. 15 (in the mouth of the Assyrian): אֱנוֹשׁ, 2 Chron. xiv. 10 (in a prayer); and many other words which occur earlier only as poetical Chaldaisms, but pass over into the ordinary popular language in the period of the exile.

(6) Besides those adduced in § 15, Note 4, add מִין, "species," Ezek. xlvii. 10 (taken from the Pentateuch); מְשׂוּרָה, "a measure," 1 Chron. xxiii. 29, Ezek. iv. 11, 16, etc., from Lev. xix. 35; נָכַל, "to act cunningly," Mal. i. 14, Ps. cv. 25, from Gen. xxxvii. 18 or Num. xxv. 18; צֶלֶם = סֶמֶל, "image," 2 Chron. xxxiii. 7, 15, and Ezek. viii. 3, 5, from Deut. iv. 16; צָהַב, "to shine like gold," Ezra viii. 27, probably formed from צָהֹב, "gold-yellow," Lev. xiii. 30, 32, 36; רְבִיד, "a necklace," Ezek. xvi. 11, from Gen. xli. 42; מְרֻבֶּכֶת, "that which has been mingled or soaked," 1 Chron. xxiii. 29, from Lev. vi. 14 and vii. 12; רֶבַע, "lying down," Ps. cxxxix. 3, formed upon Lev. xviii. 23, xix. 19, xx. 16, since elsewhere only רֶבֶץ occurs; זְעָוָה for זְוָעָה (comp. § 15, Note 7); the archaisms, which at the same time are Chaldaizing forms, הָוָה, Neh. vi. 6, Eccles. ii. 22, and יְהוֵא, Eccles. xi. 3.

§ 18. *How the Hebrew died out as the National Language.*

The Aramaic (Chaldee) language had already come to be widely known in Palestine among the Jews by means of the Chaldean invasions (Jer. x. 11); but in their state of exile it attained to such a preponderance over the Hebrew, that on their return to their mother country only the more educated (in addition to the old people who came back, Ezra iii. 12) still understood this their mother tongue. On the contrary, the generation which had grown up in exile spoke Aramaic (Chaldee), and the Hebrew ceased to be the living language of the people (1).

The opposite opinion, that the Jewish nation in Nehemiah's time still spoke Hebrew, and that the old Hebrew language maintained its position alongside of the Aramaic in individual districts, as also among the upper classes and the better educated, as the living language of

the people, till a much later time, perhaps till that of Alexander the Great (2), is not only destitute of historical evidence (3), but is also distinctly refuted by Neh. viii. 8, according to which it was necessary to add a translation of the Law which was read to the people, in order that it might be intelligible to them (4).

(1) So the Talmudists in Gemar. tr. Megilla, f. 3, col. 1; Nedarim, f. 37, col. 2: the Jewish grammarians, *Kimchi*, *Ephodæus*, *Elias Levita:* the older Christian theologians, *J. H. Hottinger*, Smegm. orient. p. 33; *Joh. Buxtorf*, dissertatt. phil. theol. p. 156 sqq. (where may be seen the opinions pronounced by learned Jews), *Walton*, Proleg. iii. 24, etc.; finally, *Hengstb.* Beitr. i. p. 299 ff.; *Häv.* Einl. i. § 35.

(2) Comp. *Barthol. Mayer*, philol. s. ii. p. 95; *Löscher*, de causis ling. Hebr. p. 67; *Alting*, Opera, v. p. 195; *Aug. Pfeiffer*, Opera, ii. p. 864 sqq.; *Carpzov*, critic. sac. p. 214 sq.; *Gesenius*, Geschichte, p. 44 ff., etc. According to *J. Olshausen*, ü. d. Ursprung des Alphab. p. 29, the Jews in certain parts of Persia, especially in Schuster [in the ancient Susia], to this day speak Hebrew as their mother tongue.

(3) The statement in Neh. xiii. 24, that the children of those Jews who had married Philistine, Ammonite, and Moabite wives, could not speak יְהוּדִית, but spoke in the language of Ashdod or of the several nations respectively, is no proof of this: for *the Jews' language* here is the designation of the language then spoken by the Jews, that is, the Aramaic, in opposition to those of these nations; and this is the meaning of Ἑβραϊστί or τῇ Ἑβράϊδι διαλέκτῳ in the Apocrypha and in the New Testament: comp. *Gesenius*, Geschichte, pp. 9 and 231; *Winer*, Chald. grammat. p. 3. Also the fact that the writers of the Old Testament posterior to the exile made use of the Hebrew language does not presuppose the continued existence of the Hebrew as the language of the people; but the reason of it is, that these latest sacred writers scrupled to abandon that language which was hallowed by the older Scriptures, on which they leant for support. "Cum scriberent historiam aut prophetias ad Judæos pertinentes, voluerunt uti eadem lingua, qua priscæ eorum historiæ et prophetiæ jam fuerant conscriptæ, si excipias pauca quædam loca ad res Chaldæorum aut Persarum pertinentia" (*Clericus* ad Neh. xiii. 24). [*Bleek*, pp. 72–3 and p. 93, considers the language of Ashdod to have been only a broader and less pure pronunciation, in accordance with his view of the substantial oneness of the Hebrew and the Canaanite languages.]

(4) Neh. viii. 8. The priests and Levites "read in the book, in the law of God, מְפֹרָשׁ, and gave the sense, and caused them to understand the reading;" where the word means "with an explanation subjoined," that is, with an interpretation added, with an explanation in Chaldee, the vulgar tongue, as appears from the context and by a comparison of Ezra iv. 18 and ver. 7. Long ago this right view was given by the Talmudists, מפרש זה תרגום; and so still *Clericus*, *Rambach*, and *Dathe*. On the contrary, the interpretation, "faithfully, word for word, truly, exactly" (by *Gesenius* and others), is in itself without foundation, and is quite unsuitable in Ezra iv. 18. [The renderings of the English version, "plainly," "distinctly," are rather in favour of the latter opinion; though even so the verse as a whole might be held to suggest, at least, that there was translation into another language which was better understood. *Bleek*, pp. 96–7, takes the view of Gesenius, etc., and thinks it incredible that the people could have forgotten their own language during the short duration of the exile, especially as they lived in masses in Babylon, and as not a few who had been carried away lived to return, and others lived on in Palestine the whole time of the exile; but were these statements less open to exception than they are, his argument might be met by the instance of the Waldenses changing from the Italian to the French language, which they carried back with them after their exile ended. It is indeed impossible to fix on any time at which the transition from Hebrew to Aramaic could so easily have taken place. If the Hebrew had vitality in itself, and strength of hold on the affections of the people at the time of the exile (including the preparatory period along with the exile strictly so called), it is difficult to understand what influences under the Persian and early Macedonian empires could be at work so powerfully as to produce this social revolution among the Jewish colonists, living in seclusion as they did, and animated as they were by a revived national and religious feeling which attached them to everything that had come down to them from their forefathers. *Bleek*, pp. 50–1 and 97–8, does certainly say that they became subject to a people who spoke Aramaic, and he appeals to the parallel case of the Phœnicians and their language. Then, on his own showing, why did not this change take place earlier, when they were not only subject to a people who spoke Aramaic, but carried captive by them to a country where they heard Aramaic continually? Or how should *Aramaic* be the language to which they were attracted by dynasties whose official languages were the *Persic* and the *Greek* respectively?]

In reference to the vernacular of Palestine in the time of Christ, comp. *Pfannkuche* in *Eichhorn*, allg. Biblioth. viii. 360 ff.; *Wiseman*,

horæ Syr. i. p. 69 sqq.; and *Renan*, *l.c.* p. 210. [*Bleek*, p. 51, adds *De Rossi's* treastise on the language of Christ, and the language which prevailed in Palestine from the time of the Maccabees, Parma 1772, pp. 244, 4to, being a reply to *Diodati*, de Christo Græce loquente, Naples 1767, 8vo; while he adds that both in *Pfannkuche* and in *De Rossi* there is much that is erroneous and exaggerated as to the relations of the Aramaic and the Greek. The opinion of *Diodati* has recently been presented to the English public with much learning and acuteness by *Alexander Roberts*, D.D., Discussions on the Gospels, London 1862.]

SECOND SECTION.

ORIGIN AND GENUINENESS OF THE INDIVIDUAL BOOKS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

§ 19. *General Classification of these Books.*

THE individual books in the Hebrew Bible are arranged neither according to their date of composition, nor yet according to their formal contents, but according to their relations to the economy of the revelation of the Old Testament. They are divided into three classes:—I. The Scriptures which lie at the foundation—the *Law*, or the *Five Books of Moses*. II. The Scriptures which carry forward the divine revelation by means of the history and prophetic testimonies of the Spirit—the *prophetico-historical* and the [predictive, or in the narrower sense] *prophetic books*. III. The Scriptures which present the subjective appropriation of the truths of revelation and the religious life of the covenant people according to its internal and external configuration—the *Hagiographa;* whether these be *poetical*, *prophetical*, or *historical*. [*Keil* and others sometimes use the Hebrew names of these three divisions of the Old Testament: they are—I. *The Torah;* II. *The Nebiyîm;* III. *The Kethubîm*.]

FIRST DIVISION.

THE FIVE BOOKS OF MOSES, OR THE LAW (הַתּוֹרָה).

Commentaries:—*Bonfrerius*, *Brentius*, *Chytræus*, *J. A. Osiander*, *Clericus*, *J. Marckius*, *Rosenmüller*, *Maurer;* see § 224 sq. *Henry Ainsworth*, Annotations upon the five books of Moses, the booke of the Psalmes, and the Canticles, London 1627, 1639, fol. [reprinted,

2 vols., Glasgow 1846]. *Joh. Sever. Vater*, Comm. üb. d. Pentat. mit Einleit. der eingeschalt. Uebersetzung von Dr. *Alex. Geddes*, merkw. krit. u. exeg. Anmerkk., u. e. Abhandlung üb. Moses u. die Verfasser des Pentat., Halle 1802–5, 3 Thle. *Mich. Baumgarten*, theol. comment. zum Pentat., 2 Hälften, Kiel 1843–4. *Aug. Knobel*, (in the kurzgefasst. exeget. Handbuch), 1852 and onwards; [a second edition of Genesis, 1860. *C. F. Keil* on the Books of Moses, in the biblischer Commentar über das Alte Testament, herausgegeben von *Keil* u. *Delitzsch*, 1861–2.]

For Genesis:—*Luther*, *Selneccer*, *J. Gerhard* (also on Deut.), *Seb. Schmidt*, *Calvin*, *Musculus*, *Marloratus*, *Mercerus*, etc.; see § 224. *A. Haitsma*, curæ philol. exeg. in Genes., Franequer. 1753; comm. in Exod. 1771, 4to. *G. A. Schumann*, Pentat. Hebr. et Græc. cum annotatt. perp., vol. i. Genesis, Lipsiæ 1829. *Pet. v. Bohlen*, die Genesis, etc., Königsberg 1835. *J. Nic. Tiele*, das 1 Buch Moses übersetzt u. comment., Band. i., Erlangen 1836. *Fr. Tuch*, Komm. über d. Genesis, Halle 1838. *Fr. Delitzsch*, die Genesis ausgelegt [Leipzig 1852]; 2d ed. re-written, 2 Theile, 1853 [3d ed. 1860. *J. P. Lange*, translated into English 1860. *James Murphy*, LL.D., Edinburgh 1863; and on Exodus, Edinburgh 1866. *M. Kalisch* on Genesis, London 1858; and on Exodus, 1855].

For Introduction:—*Fr. H. Ranke*, Untersuchungen über d. Pentat. aus dem Gebiete d. höheren Kritik, 2 Bde., Erlangen 1834–40, 8vo. *Hengstenberg*, Beitrr. Bd. ii. and iii. (Die Authentie des Pentat. erwiesen, Bd. i. and ii.). *Bened. Welte*, Nachmosaisches im Pentat. beleuchtet, Karlsruhe u. Freiburg 1841. [*Vaihinger*, art. Pentateuch in *Herzog's* Encyclopædia. Bishop *Colenso*, The Pentateuch and Joshua examined, 4 vols., London 1862; and many replies to him, by Dr. *Alex. M'Caul*, *J. H. Arnold*, etc. *W. Smith*, The Book of Moses; or, the Pentateuch in its authority, credibility, and civilisation, vol. i., London 1868. *D. Macdonald*, Introduction to the Pentateuch, 2 vols., Edinburgh 1861.]

§ 20. *Names and Division of the Pentateuch.*

In the Hebrew Canon the books of Moses are named *the Book of the Law*, or more briefly, *The Law* (1), since this is the most important portion of their contents. The name given by the Rabbins, on account of the division of the work, is חֲמִשָּׁה חוּמְשֵׁי הַתּוֹרָה (the five-fifths of the Law) (2); that given by the Greeks is ἡ Πενταΐτευχος, *sc.* *βίβλος* (*Origen*, t. xiv. in Joh. p. 218); and that given by the

Latins is *Pentateuchus, sc. liber* (*Tertullian* contr. Marc. i. 10) (3). [To which names *Bleek*, p. 160, adds *the five books of Moses*, as given by *Rufinus*, expos. in Symb. Apost., and *Jerome*, prolog. galeat.]

(1) *The Book of the Law*, Deut. xxxi. 26, comp. xxviii. 61, xxix. 20, xxx. 10, Josh. i. 8, viii. 34, 2 Kings xxii. 8, 11, 2 Chron. xxxiv. 15, Neh. viii. 3; or, *the Book of the Law of Jehovah*, 2 Chron. xvii. 9, xxxiv. 14, Neh. ix. 3; or, *the Book of the Law of God*, Neh. viii. 18, comp. Josh. xxiv. 26; or, *the Book of the Law of Moses*, Josh. viii. 31, 2 Kings xiv. 6, Neh. viii. 1; or merely, *the Book of Moses*, 2 Chron. xxv. 4, xxxv. 12, Ezra vi. 18, Neh. xiii. 1; or, *the Law of Moses*, 2 Chron. xxiii. 18, Ezra iii. 2, vii. 6; or simply, *the Law*, Neh. viii. 2, 7, 13, 14, comp. 2 Chron. xxv. 4.

(2) Comp. *Hottinger*, thesaur. philol. p. 460.

(3) *Stange*, "Cujus generis est Pentateuchus?" in *Keil's* u. *Tzschirner's* Analekt. i. 1, p. 22, wrongly takes the word to be neuter. [*Bleek*, p. 160, says the gender in *Tertullian* is not determined; but that it certainly ought to be feminine, as in Greek, though it is often taken to be masculine, on account of *liber*, as in German.]

The Law has been from the beginning divided into five books. Each of the three books—the first, and third, and fifth—is in itself a complete unity; so that the second and fourth are at the same time marked out as separate portions of the entire work (4). The individual books receive their names, among the Jews, from the initial words; but among the Christians, from their subject-matter (5).

(4) According to *Leusden*, phil. Hebr. p. 45 sq., and *C. v. Lengerke*, Kenaan, p. lxxxii., the division came from the Septuagint; according to *Michaelis*, Einl. ins Alte Testament, p. 302 f., it is more ancient than this, yet not from the beginning. Comp. against these views, *Delitzsch*, Gen. i. p. 18. [*Vaihinger*, p. 293, thinks it later than the division of the Proverbs into four parts: the logical connection in such argumentation does not seem very distinct. *Bleek*, p. 160, remarks that the fivefold division of the Book of Psalms is adverse to the conjecture that the fivefold division of the Pentateuch originated with the Septuagint.]

(5) Alongside of the names from the initial words—1*st*, בְּרֵאשִׁית; 2*d*, וְאֵלֶּה שְׁמוֹת, or shorter, שְׁמוֹת; 3*d*, וַיִּקְרָא; 4*th*, וַיְדַבֵּר or בְּמִדְבַּר; 5*th*, אֵלֶּה הַדְּבָרִים, and shorter, דְּבָרִים [names which, says *Bleek*, p. 161, are found already in *Origen* ad Ps. i., and in *Jerome*, prolog. galeat. He adds that *Origen* calls the Jewish name for Numbers Ἀμμεσφεκωδείμ,

which may possibly be a composition of הַמִּסְפָּרִים and פְּקוּדִים; while one of *Bleek's* students communicated to him the conjecture that it might have come from a name which *Raschi* has given to it, חֻמָּשׁ פְּקוּדִים] —there are also found the designations from the contents, סֵפֶר יְצִירָה, נְזִיקִין (comp. *Buxt.* Lexicon Talm. p. 1325), סֵפֶר תּוֹרַת כֹּהֲנִים or תּוֹרַת הַמִּסְפָּרִים הַקְּרֵבָנוֹת or הַפְּקוּדִים, and מִשְׁנֵה תּוֹרָה or סֵפֶר תּוֹכָחוֹת. Compare *Hottinger*, Thesaur. phil. p. 460 sqq.; *Wolf*, biblioth. Hebr. ii. p. 72. The Christian names are—*Γένεσις*, Genesis; *Ἔξοδος*, Exodus; *Λευϊτικός*, Leviticus; *Ἀριθμοί*, Numeri; and *Δευτερονόμιον*, Deuteronomium. Comp. *Leusden*, philol. Hebr. p. 46.

§ 21. *Contents of the Five Books.*

The Pentateuch narrates how the foundations of the theocracy were laid, and contains the theocratic legislation.

I. *Genesis* relates the preparations for the theocracy. Starting from the creation, *in the first half* of the book (ch. i.–xi. 25) we are informed of the primitive condition of the earth and man, of the fall, of the early patriarchs till the flood; then of the earth being peopled by the descendants of Noah, and of their being divided into various nations; and of the patriarchal genealogy from Shem to Abraham. *The other half* (ch. xi. 26–l.) begins with an account of Abraham's kindred, and of his call to be the father of the covenant people and the depositary of the revelation of grace; and then it relates how he and his descendants were guided in Canaan, until their migration into Egypt, and the death of Jacob and Joseph.

II. *The three middle books* give the history of the founding of the theocracy, and of the legislation for it, in uninterrupted connection. The *second* book relates how Israel was brought out of the bondage of Egypt, was led to Sinai, and was brought completely into the covenant, by being solemnly accepted as God's people, by having the fundamental laws and rights of this covenant promulgated, and by having the tabernacle erected. The *third* contains the laws relating to offerings, purifications, sacred seasons, and various offences and transgressions irreconcilable with the destination of Israel to be God's holy people; together with promises and threatenings [as they should realize their ideal, or should fail to do so]. The *fourth* gives the history of the departure from Sinai, and of the march through the wilderness, from the second year of the exodus to the

beginning of the fortieth; and the principal events of this period, especially the repeated revolts of the people, which led to the rejection of that refractory generation, and the conquest and possession of the territory east of Jordan; also the laws and ordinances published during this interval of time (1).

(1) The details of the contents of these books are successively presented as follows:—The *second* book begins with the preparations for fulfilling the promises made to the fathers, and relates (*a*) the steps which prepared the way for the redemption of Israel out of Egypt; the increase of Jacob's descendants into a numerous people, and their oppression in Egypt (ch. i.); the birth and wonderful preservation of Moses (ch. ii.), his call to be the leader of Israel out of Egypt, and his preparation for this (ch. iii.–vi. 13): (*b*) the steps which rendered the redemption possible; the genealogy of Moses and Aaron, and their mission to Pharaoh (vi. 14–vii. 7); the signs and wonders which effected the exodus, together with the institution of the passover (vii. 8–xii. 8). Then follows the history of Israel being led to Sinai: (*a*) The exodus, with the ordinances then published in reference to the passover and the consecration of the first-born (ch. xii. 29–xiii. 16); (*b*) the march to the Red Sea, the miraculous guidance through it, together with the overthrow of Pharaoh and his host in it, and Moses' song of praise for Israel's miraculous redemption out of Egypt (ch. xiii. 17–xv. 21); (*c*) the march of Israel to the mount of God, with the arrival of Jethro in the camp, and his advice (ch. xv. 22–xviii.). Finally, the account is given of the founding of the theocracy: that is to say, (*a*) the establishment of the covenant by the choice of Israel to be Jehovah's peculiar treasure and a kingdom of priests, and the promulgation of the ten commandments and of the fundamental statutes for the life of the people of Israel, together with the solemn act of concluding the covenant (ch. xix.–xxiv. 11); (*b*) the command to erect the tabernacle, and the receipt of the tables of stone (ch. xxiv. 12–xxxi. 18); (*c*) the narrative of the apostasy of Israel, and of their reception anew, upon the intercession of Moses (ch. xxxii.–xxxiv.); (*d*) the narrative of the construction and erection of the tabernacle, or the execution of the commands issued in ch. xxv.–xxxi. (ch. xxxv.–xl.).

The *third* book gives (*a*) the laws for offerings (ch. i.–vii.); (*b*) the narrative of the anointing of the sanctuary and the consecration of the priests, together with some ordinances for them (ch. viii.–x.); (*c*) rules as to clean and unclean animals, as to cleanness and uncleanness in men, and as to the annual cleansing of the sanctuary from all the uncleanness of the people by means of the

great day of atonement (ch. xi.–xvi.); (*d*) laws as to various offences and transgressions, for which there is no atonement, but inevitable punishment (ch. xvii.–xx.); (*e*) rules as to the priests and the offerings being free of blemish, and as to the sacred seasons, together with promises and threatenings (ch. xxi.–xxvi.); and, as an appendix, commands about vows, things devoted, and tithes (ch. xxvii.).

The *fourth* book contains—(1) The preparations for immediate departure from Sinai: (*a*) the numbering, reviewing, and arrangements for encamping, or the position of the twelve tribes in reference to the sanctuary, both in the camp and on the march (ch. i.–iv.); (*b*) various ordinances for preserving the purity of the camp and of the people, as well as equipments and appointments for the transport of the sanctuary (ch. v.–viii.); (*c*) the feast of the passover, with the ordinances for a later feast permitted to those who had been unclean at the proper time, together with the command to manufacture silver trumpets, with which to give the signal for assembling the congregation, and for breaking up the camp, and for encamping (ch. ix.–x. 10). (2) The breaking up of the camp, and the march of the people till the beginning of the fortieth year, with the laws given during this time: (*a*) the breaking up of the camp (x. 11–35); (*b*) the most important events of the second year, or the occurrences at Taberah, at Kibroth-hattaavah, at Hazeroth, and in the desert of Paran, in consequence of which the generation which had been brought out of Egypt were condemned to die in the wilderness (ch. xi.–xiv.); (*c*) laws as to the meat-offering and the presentation of the first-born, as to sins of ignorance and of presumption, along with the history of a Sabbath-breaker, and again laws as to memorials upon their garments (ch. xv.); (*d*) the history of the rebellion of Korah, and the consequent divine confirmation of the priesthood in the family of Aaron, and various ordinances relating to the priests and the Levites (ch. xvi.–xviii.); (*e*) the law as to the way and manner of purification from uncleanness contracted by touching a dead body (ch. xix.). (3) The events and ordinances of the first ten months of the fortieth year: (*a*) the strife of the people with Moses and Aaron on account of a want of water, the embassy to the king of Edom, the death of Aaron, the conquest of the king of Arad, the murmuring of the people and their chastisement by fiery serpents, the march from Mount Hor to Pisgah, and the conquest of Sihon and Og (xx. xxi.); (*b*) the occurrences in the plains of Moab, Balaam and his prophecies (ch. xxii.–xxiv.), the idolatry of the Israelites and its punishment, the new census (ch. xxv. xxvi.), the determination of the law of inheritance occasioned by the claim of the daughters of Zelophehad, the choice and

consecration of Joshua to be the leader of the people into Canaan (ch. xxvii.); (*c*) rules as to the offerings at the feasts, and as to vows (ch. xxviii.–xxx.); (*d*) conquest of the Midianites, and division of the eastern territory among the tribes of Reuben, Gad, and half Manasseh (ch. xxxi. xxxii.); (*e*) a tabular view of the journeys and encampments of the people (ch. xxxiii. 1–49); (*f*) renewal of the law for expelling the Canaanites, ordinances as to the boundaries of Canaan and its division among the remaining tribes, as to the Levitical cities and the cities of refuge, and as to the marriage of heiresses (ch. xxxiii. 50–xxxvi.). The most of the laws in this book relate to the political administration among the people, as has been already remarked by *Carpzov*, Introd. i. p. 46.

III. The *fifth* book contains three addresses to the Israelites by Moses, in the plains of Moab, over against Jericho, in the eleventh month of the fortieth year after the exodus from Egypt. In these discourses he exhorts them willingly to obey the divine commands; and he expounds, and supplements, and inculcates the law (ch. i.–xxx.) (2). It then relates how the book of the law was solemnly handed over to the Levites; and it gives the words which accompanied this act, and the song of Moses (ch. xxxi.–xxxii. 47). And it closes with three appendices: (*a*) the announcement of his death made to Moses; (*b*) his blessing; (*c*) the narrative of his death itself (ch. xxxii. 48–xxxiv.).

(2) In the *first* address (ch. i.–iv. 40), Moses recapitulates the history of the march through the wilderness, as an encouragement and as a warning against apostasy: to this is annexed the appointment of the cities of refuge east of Jordan (ch. iv. 41–43). In the *second* he recapitulates the legislation, with urgent paternal admonitions to maintain the law, and with many more precise determinations and modifications of earlier ordinances and rights (ch. v.–xxvi.). The *third*, in two divisions, urges powerfully upon the hearts of the people the duty of observing the law, holding out to them the blessing and the curse connected with it, so that they might renew the covenant with Jehovah (ch. xxvii. and xxviii., xxix. and xxx.).

§ 22. *Aim and Plan of the Pentateuch.*

The contents of the Pentateuch are a combination of history and legislation, in such a way as to narrate in the historical portions how the people came into existence, and also how the divine covenant was

concluded with them; and in the legislative portions to set forth what was comprised in this covenant, according to its laws and rights, its promises and threatenings. And the aim of the book is to represent *the historical origin and the juridical foundation of the theocracy*, that is, of the divine commonwealth of Israel, in order that Israel on the one hand might learn to fear Jehovah their God, and to take care to keep all His commandments, and on the other hand might have in this book of the law a witness against their sin and stubbornness in relation to Jehovah (Deut. xxxi. 9–13, 24–27).

This being the aim of the work, we see what is consequently the theocratic plan on which it has been executed in all its individual parts. Conformably to this plan, there is already in Genesis such a description of the way in which the chosen people came into existence, that we are led back to the creation and the primeval history of man: with the double purpose of being thus convinced of the necessity of the theocratic institutions of salvation, on account of the fall and the prevalent moral corruption; and again of being made to see clearly the connection of the whole human race with that family which was chosen to be the depositary of this saving revelation (1).

(1) For this reason, the accounts of the primeval history of men are confined to those operating forces which give us information as to their original condition, their apostasy from God, and their development in two lines of descent, mutually opposed, so far as concerns their deportment towards Him (a godless and a God-fearing line), until their intermingling led to the judgment of the deluge. Then comes the account of how the world was peopled by different tribes, from the one family which had been saved, that of Noah, who was found righteous; the rise of these nations, their degeneracy, and the line of descent from Noah to Abraham, who was chosen to be the father of the covenant people. Thus the history of mankind runs out into the history of a single family, which receives the promise that God will multiply it into a great people, will make it a blessing to all the families of the earth, and will give it the land of Canaan as an everlasting possession. In consequence of this, the other families and nations are one after another shut out from the field of view, till the narrative is concentrated upon the history of the patriarchs; and even within this circle the chosen seed of Abraham continues to be separated from families connected with him, nay, from families descended from him, down to Jacob, who begets twelve sons, the

fathers of the twelve tribes of Israel. The disposition of the whole book of Genesis is therefore genealogical: not only in this respect, that its genealogies form, as it were, the red thread along which the history runs, from Adam on to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (comp. *Ranke*, Untersuchungen, i. p. 10 ff.); but in this respect also, that its whole contents form ten members, organically connected, which are called *books of the generations* (comp. *Kurtz*, Einheit der Genesis, p. lxvii. ff.).

The theocratic plan becomes still more obvious in the three middle books of the Pentateuch. In its historical passages, those facts and events alone are narrated at large which concern God's doings for His people, or to them, or else the conduct of the people to their God. Everything else is either passed over entirely, like the thirty-eight years of wandering in the wilderness, during which the generation brought forth from Egypt was rejected by God, and condemned to die out in the wilderness; or it is compressed into a summary notice, like that of the four hundred years which Israel sojourned in Egypt (Ex. i.). In like manner, the legislative passages contain only those laws which relate to the honour to be given to Jehovah, and to the education of Israel in order to be a people holy to God; so that even the political, civil, and family life of the people, in so far as regulated by special laws, is directed to the highest objects. Finally, the fifth book is merely a recapitulation of the history and the laws in the earlier books under the form of paternal admonition; throughout which, therefore, the definite purpose is everywhere transparent—that of making the heart of the people inclined and willing to keep the covenant faithfully.

§ 23. *Sources of Information, or Documents, in the Pentateuch.*

As Genesis narrates events the latest of which occurred some centuries before the time of Moses, the older theologians already busied themselves with the inquiry about the sources to which it is to be traced back (1).

(1) Already *Vitringa* (Observatt. sacr. l. i. 4, p. 36 sqq., ed. 1707) propounded the view, that in the book of Genesis Moses had employed sketches written by the patriarchs: "Schedas et scrinia Patrum

(or *ὑπομνήματα* Patriarcharum) apud Israelitas conservata Mosen opinamur collegisse, digessisse, ornasse, et ubi deficiebant compilasse, et ex iis priorem librorum suorum confecisse." And he seeks a foundation for this conjecture in the titles, "These are the generations of," etc. Written sources, though without any more exact determination of their nature, were assumed by *Clericus*, Dissertat. de Scriptore Pentat. § 11; and by *Rich. Simon*, histor. crit. Vet. Testamenti, l. i. c. vii.; whom *Jahn*, *Rosenmüller*, and others have been content simply to follow. [*Bleek*, pp. 234–5, observes that the use and partial appropriation of such earlier sources of information is decidedly rejected by the recent defenders of the simple Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch—*Sack*, *Hengstb.*, *Häv.*, *Ranke*, *Drechsler*, *M. Baumgarten*, *Welte*, *J. H. Kurtz*, and *Keil*; though he himself is surprised at their refusal to make use of what is in no way at variance with their position. But probably they have been influenced partly by the sound philosophical principle of dislike for hypothetical assumptions, since there is no proper evidence that these sources ever existed; and partly by a natural revulsion of feeling from a course, even in its commencements, which their opponents have pursued to extravagant and mischievous lengths.]

No special interest, however, was attached to this investigation till after the middle of last century, when more attention came to be given to what some of the fathers had already spoken about (2),—the changes in the names for God, *Elohim* and *Jehovah*, as used in the different sections, and strikingly prominent in the earliest chapters; from which, along with certain other marks, the attempt was made to point out various "documents in the first book of Moses" (3).

(2) *Tertullian*, *Augustin*, *Chrysostom*; comp. *Hengstb.* Beitrr. ii. p. 181 ff.

(3) The physician *Astruc* [a doctor and professor of medicine at Paris, died in 1766, says *Bleek*, p. 228], in his "Conjectures sur les Mémoires originaux" [which name came to be generally, though not quite exactly, rendered in German by "Urkunden," says *Bleek*; and which we have translated "documents," as is usually done, though it might have been better to keep to the French name "Original Memoirs"], "dont il parait que Moyse s'est servi, pour composer le livre de la Genèse," Bruxelles 1753, was the first who attempted to explain this change by the entirely external reason, that Moses had compiled Genesis from two principal documents, distinguished by the exclusive

use of Elohim and Jehovah respectively, inserting additional matter from ten smaller memoirs. [*Bleek* adds, p. 229, that Astruc supposed these to be arranged by Moses in twelve columns, which came to be written continuously; and thus, by the fault of transcribers, it happened that some things were made to occupy wrong places.] This hypothesis attracted little regard in the beginning: honour was first done to it by *Eichhorn*, who embellished it further in the Repert. iv. p. 173 ff., and in his Einleitung, iii. § 412 ff., 4th ed.; and by his follower *Ilgen*, die Urkunden des Jerusal. Tempelarchivs in ihrer Urgestalt, Halle 1798 [first and only published part, says *Bleek*, p. 229 f., adding that his view was "as unnatural and improbable as possible"]; and by *Gramberg*, libri Geneseos sec. fontes rite dignoscendos adumbratio nova, Lipsiæ 1828. These writers carried out the dismemberment of Genesis, through the entire book, upon this principle; and, not to notice minor matters, they diverged chiefly in this respect, that *Ilgen* (to whose point of view *Hupfeld*, die Quellen der Gen. und die Art ihrer Zusammenstellung von neuem unters., Berlin 1853, has recently returned) affirmed that there were three documents, two Elohistic and one Jehovistic; whereas the other two critics admitted only a single Elohistic and a single Jehovistic document, with sundry minor interpolations. [*Bleek*, pp. 233–4, says *Hupfeld's* work is a reprint from his paper in the Deutsche Zeitschrift f. Christliche Wissenschaft u. Christliches Leben, 1853. He considers Genesis a compilation from three independent historical documents: the first Elohist beginning with the creation, and ending with the partition of Canaan, as given in the latter part of the book of Joshua; the second Elohist extending over the history of the patriarchs, and generally occupying a position nearer to the Jehovist, the third writer, who begins with creation, as the first writer did,—the present book of Genesis being formed out of these three by a fourth, the editor, who uses their very words, yet alters, omits, and corrects one account by another.] See the tabular view of these schemes for dismemberment in *Vater's* Abhandlung üb. Moses u. die Verfasser des Pentat., at the end of the third volume of his Commentary, § 90; *Schumann*, Genes. Hebr. et Gr. p. lvi. sqq.; and the catalogue of those who professed their adherence to this hypothesis, in *Hartmann's* hist. krit. Forschungen üb. d. Bildung, d. Zeitalter, u. d. Plan der fünf Bücher Mosis, Rostock 1831, p. 86 ff.

Immediately after this, other critics began to disintegrate the entire Pentateuch into a mass of almost innumerable fragments (4), according to the frequently repeated titles and concluding formulas,

the manifold repetitions, and the alleged varying accounts of one and the same set of events (5).

(4) The idea of *fragments* was first put forward by an anonymous writer in *Henke's* Magazin f. Religions-philos. vi. 1, p. 221 ff., in the article "Etwas üb. die Fragm. aus denen die Genes. Zusammengesetzt ist." It was applied to the Pentateuch in an elaborate form by *Vater* and *Hartmann*, *ibid.* Both of them at the same time attacked the hypothesis of documents, so far as it stood in the way of the hypothesis of fragments: on the contrary, others—for instance *De Wette*, in his Beitrr. vol. ii., and in the first editions of his Einleitung—tried to unite both hypotheses under certain limitations.

(5) Already *Ilgen* had alleged, as reasons for separating the original documents, the many titles, the frequent repetitions of the same things, the variety of the style, and the peculiarity of the character, by which many parts are distinguished from others. And so *Möller*, üb. d. Verschiedenheit des Styls der beiden Haupturk. der Genesis, Göttingen 1792.

There now appeared influential opponents of this entirely external treatment of the book, who successfully assailed not only the argument borrowed from the change in the divine names by developing the distinctive meanings of Jehovah and Elohim, but also the remaining reasons given for dismemberment; and besides replying to negative criticism, they aimed at establishing firmly the unity of the Pentateuch by pointing out its plan and its single object, as well as the internal connection of all the individual parts with this plan and object (6). Upon this, the hypothesis of fragments was abandoned, and that of documents was transformed into the *hypothesis of supplements*. It acknowledges, indeed, a unity of plan in the book, yet always denies that this unity was there from the beginning; and it not only supposes the Pentateuch to have come into existence by a process of working up very important interpolations and *supplements* into the *fundamental document*, but it also has attempted to determine these twofold elements in the individual instances (7).

(6) Modest doubts as to thoroughly carrying out the hypothesis of documents were expressed by *Velthusen*, Animadverss. critt. potissimum ad archæologiam sacram, Helmstädt 1781; by *Corrodi*, Beitrr. zur Beförd. des vernunft. Denkens, H. iv. p. 104 ff.; by *Jahn*, Einl. ii. p. 99 f.; and by others. Its foundation—the assumption

that there was no difference of meaning between Elohim and Jehovah —was assailed by *Hasse*, Entdeckungen im Felde der ältest. Erd-Menschengesch. ii. Thle., Halle 1801 and 1805, but only with the groundless hypothesis that Jehovah was the God of husbandry, who assailed and overcame the Demiurgi Elohim; better, only too briefly, by *Sack*, de usu nominum Dei אלהים et יהוה in libro Genes., in his commentatt. ad theologiam hist., Bonn 1821; and by *Fr. v. Meyer*, die Namen Gottes, in d. Blätter f. höhere Wahrheit, Th. viii. p. 372 ff.; more copiously by *Ewald*, die Kompos. der Genes. kritisch untersucht, Braunschweig 1823, who indeed determined the relation between Elohim and Jehovah in a manner much too external and unsatisfactory [*Bleek*, pp. 231–2, observes that he did not at all vindicate it for Moses or the Mosaic age, and that he seemed to treat it more as a poetical than a historical composition]; and therefore at a later time again he surrendered the unity of Genesis (comp. theol. Studien u. Krit. 1831, p. 595 ff., a review of Stähelin's book, mentioned in the next note). [*Bleek*, p. 232, also refers to the Berliner Jahrbücher f. Wissenschaftliche Kritik, March 1831.] But *Ewald* most happily and successfully refuted the other reasons which were thought valid in favour of the hypothesis of documents and that of fragments. This was done still more thoroughly by *Hengstb.*, die Gottesnamen im Pentat., in the second volume of his Beitrr. p. 181 ff. *Drechsler*, die Einheit u. Æchtheit der Genes., Hamburg 1838, busied himself more with positive indications of the unity of Genesis; and *Ranke*, Untersuchungen üb. d. Pent., *Häv.*, and *Welte*, Nachmosaisches, p. 76 ff., with the same for the entire Pentateuch.

(7) The way was paved for the hypothesis of supplements by *Stähelin*, krit. Untersuchungen über d. Genesis, Basel 1830; *Ewald*, Stud. u. Krit., *ibid.*; *P. von Bohlen*, Genesis, p. clxxxv. ff.: it was elaborated by *Tuch*, Commentar üb. d. Genes. p. xxx. ff.; *Stähelin*, krit. Unterss. üb. d. Pentat., die BB. Jos., Richt., Sam., u. der Könige, Berlin 1843, and already earlier in his Beitrr. zu den krit. Unterss. üb. d. Pent., etc., in theol. Studien u. Krit. 1835, p. 461 ff.; *C. v. Lengerke*, Kenaan, p. lxxxi. ff.; *Knobel*, d. Genes. erklärt. Comp. besides, *Killisch*, Versuch einer Kritik des i. B. Mosis, Berlin 1841; and *De Wette*, Einl. § 150 ff. of the 5th, 6th, and 7th ed. [*Bleek*, pp. 230–1, makes *De Wette* agree substantially with *von Bohlen*; adheres himself to the same opinion; and claims *Delitzsch*, who is to be mentioned immediately, as very much at one with them, which is true only in a certain sense, and that not the most natural one. *Vaihinger* also, in *Herzog's* Encycl., art. Pentateuch, p. 324 ff., seems to follow the same course, though one might perhaps class him

among the supporters of the hypothesis of documents. He acknowledges three writers,—namely, first and second, the usual Elohist and Jehovist; and thirdly, instead of a younger Elohist, such as many name a "Vor-Elohist," or predecessor of the Elohist, of whose work we have only fragments.] This hypothesis of supplements was assailed by *Welte*, Nachmosaische, p. 154 ff.; more thoroughly by *Kurtz*, Beitrr. zur Vertheid. u. Begrund. der Einheit des Pentat. i., Königsberg 1844, and die Einheit der Genesis, Berlin 1846. Comp. *Oehler* in *Tholuck's* Litt. Anzeiger 1847, Nos. 76–78; whereas, again, *Delitzsch*, d. Genesis, i. p. 30 ff., has taken this hypothesis under his protection.

Ewald, Gesch. des Volks Israel, Theil i. p. 81 ff., has carried still further this resolution of the Pentateuch into atoms. Not only in the pretended fundamental document, or "Book of Origins," has he traced fragments of three older historical works; in the remaining part of the Pentateuch he discovers what is peculiar to each of three "prophetical narrators of the early history," and a purely artistic elaboration of that history by the Deuteronomist, together with a larger interpolation; so that "the great Book of Origins" owes its existence to the contributions of at least eight or nine different writers (!).

§ 24. *The Constitution or Nature of the imaginary Fundamental Document.*

The so-called fundamental document is said to give a connected account of the whole time from the origin of the world till the death of Moses and the conquest of Canaan, in such a way that the plan and arrangement of the present Pentateuch are conditioned by it; that the legislative portion is taken from it; and that in the historical portion, the principal features, nay, in pretty large portions the entire working out of the details, belongs to it alone (1).

(1) *Tuch*, *ibid.* p. li. [*Bleek*, pp. 252–256, says also that there is no evidence of an independent connected document from a Jehovist: his work is simply filling up, together with frequently a little alteration at the beginning or the end of a narrative, the better to adjust the old and the new portions to one another. At other times, he says, there certainly have been greater alterations, as in Gen. vi.–ix., xxii. 1–19. In general, he thinks that these additions had not previously existed in a written form, though from this statement he excepts Gen. ii. 4–iii. 24, iv. 23, 24, xiv., x. 8–12, probably also vi. 1–4, xlix. 1–27. Again, pp. 259–261, whilst he thinks *Ewald's* precise statements about

documents are incapable of proof, and arbitrary, still he thinks that the Elohist continued his work down to the possession of the land of Canaan; and that there were older written documents which he used, especially a history of Joseph, which may have been written in Egypt.] Accordingly, the individual portions of the Pentateuch are divided between the fundamental document and the supplementer as follows:

[In this table, *a* and *b* mark the first and second half of a verse: in one or two cases *c* and *d* also occur, the verse being divided into three or four parts. Comp. *Bleek*, especially pp. 246–9, whose divergences are noted here in the first column.

Fundamental Document. In Genesis.	Supplementer. In Genesis.
i. 1–ii. 3.	
	ii. 3–iv. end.
v. 1–29*a*, 30–32,	v. 29*b*.
vi. 9–22,	vi. 1–8.
vii. 11–viii. 16*a*, 17–19 [*Bleek*, p. 245, says, vii. 6–viii. 19, except most of vii. 8*a*, 10, and 16*b*],	vii. i–10, 16*b*, viii. 20–22.
ix. 1–17, 28, 29,	ix. 18–27.
x. (but wrought up by a later hand.) [*Bleek*, p. 225, seems to except only vers. 8–12.]	
xi. 10–32 [*Bleek* says, vers. 10–26],	xi. 1–9.
xii. 5, 6, 8 [though ver. 8*b* seems generally to be considered Jehovistic],	xii. 1–4, 7, 9–20.
xiii. 18,	xiii. 1–17.
[*Bleek*, p. 266, says, perhaps xvi. 1, 3, 4*a*, 15, 16],	xiv.–xvi.
xvii. [*Bleek*, however, makes a limitation as to ver. 1].	
xix. 29,	xviii. 1–xix. 28, 30–38.
xx. 1–17 [*Bleek* says, perhaps not ver. 17*b*],	xx. 18.
xxi. 2–32 [*Bleek* says, xxi. 1–21, 22–31*a*],	xxi. 1, 33, 34.
xxii. 1–13, 19–24 [*Bleek* says, 1–13, 19; or 1–19, with alterations],	xxii. 14–18.
xxiii.	xxiv.
xxv. 1–20, 24–34 [*Bleek* says, 1–11, and probably vers. 12–18],	xxv. 21–23.
xxvi. 34, 35,	xxvi. 1–33.
xxvii. 46,	xxvii. 1–45.
xxviii. 1–12, 17–21*a*, 22 [*Bleek* says, xxviii. 1–5, and also the rest, but with alterations],	xxviii. 13–16, 21*b*.
xxix. (with vers. 31–35 undetermined).	
xxx. 1–13, 17–24*a*,	xxx. 14–16, 24*b*–43.
xxxi. 4–48, 50–54,	xxxi. 1–3, 49.
xxxii. 1–12, 14, 33,	xxxii. 13, 15–32 (?).
xxxiii.–xxxvi.	
xxxvii. 2–36 [*Bleek* says, ch. xxxvii., with alterations],	xxxvii. 1 (?).

Fundamental Document.	Supplementer.
In Genesis.	In Genesis.
	xxxviii.
xxxix. 6–20, xl.–l., [*Bleek* says, ch. xxxix. ff., with alterations, xlii.–xlviii., xlix. 28–l. 26], . . .	xxxix. 1–5, 21–23.
In Exodus.	In Exodus.
i. 1–14, ii. 23–25 [*Bleek*, p. 273, says, probably i. 1–22, and in addition to ii. 23–25, perhaps vers. 1–22], ...	i. 15–ii. 22.
[*Bleek*, *ibid.*, also thinks it probable that something had been here originally, of which iii. 11–15 is a remnant], . . .	iii.–vi. 1.
vi. 2–vii. 7 [*Bleek*, *ibid.*, thinks certainly vi. 2–8; also partly re-written, 14–27], . .	vii. 8–xi.
xii. 1–38, 40–51, ...	xii. 39 (probably).
xiii. 1, 2 (doubtful) [*Bleek*, p. 276, says xiii. 17–20], ...	xiii. 3–xv.
xvi.	
[*Bleek*, p. 276, says xviii., and probably much more], ...	xvii., xviii.
xix. 1, ...	xix. 2–25.
xx.–xxiii. (according to *Ewald*, an insertion from an older writing) [*Bleek*, p. 276, says xx. 2–14, and probably much more],	xx.–xxiv. (according to Stähelin).
xxv.–xxxi. [*Bleek* says xxv.–xxxi. 17].	
xxxv.–xl.	xxxii.–xxxiv.
In Leviticus.	In Leviticus.
The whole [*Bleek*, pp. 281–2, excepts, as at least re-written, xix., xx., xxi., xxii., xxvi. 3–45, and perhaps xviii. 3, 24, 25, 27, 28; at p. 311 he inclines to attribute xxvi. 3–45 to the Deuteronomist], ...	Only xx. 20–25 is wrought up by a later hand; and xxvi. 3–45 is from the Supplementer.
In Numbers.	In Numbers.
i.–x. 28, ...	x. 29–36.
xiii. 2–16 (wrought up by a later hand), .	xii.–xiii. 1, 17–33.
	xiv.
xv.	
xvi. 1, 2–11, 16–23, 24 (?) [*Bleek*, especially pp. 284–289, seems to make more difficulty about fixing exactly which are to be regarded as the supplementary passages in Numbers, though he includes in them iii., xiv. 5–10*a*, 26–38, and perhaps the prophecies of Balaam], ...	xvi. 12–15, 25–34.
xvii.–xix.	
xx. 1–13, 22–29, ...	xx. 14–21.
	xxi.–xxiv.

Fundamental Document. In Numbers.	Supplementer. In Numbers.
xxv.-xxvii., ...	xxvi. 8-11 (?).
xxviii.-xxx., xxxi.	
xxxii. 5, 28-42 (vers. 1-4 undetermined),	xxxii. 6-27.
xxxiii.-xxxvi.	
In Deuteronomy.	**In Deuteronomy.**
[*Bleek*, pp. 306-9, seems not quite sure about the historical portions, iv. 41-43, xxvii. 1-8, xxxii. 48-52, xxxiv., how much may have been in the earlier or in the second writer],	i.-xxxii. 47.
xxxii. 48-52, and xxxiv. 1-9, . . .	xxxiii., xxxiv. 10-12.

Comp. *De Wette*, Einl. § 150–154, *von Lengerke*, *Stähelin*, and *Knobel*, in the works mentioned in § 23. Yet these critics often diverge very widely in their division of individual verses, and even of whole chapters. [As additional specimens of the results attained by recent criticism, the reader may examine the following tables, which may serve as examples of two more complicated arrangements than those of *Tuch* and *Bleek*, who acknowledge only two writers in general.

Dr. *Samuel Davidson*, Introduction to the Old Testament, vol. i. pp. 58–61, assigns the composition of the Pentateuch to four authors—the Elohist, the Younger Elohist, the Jehovist, and the Redactor. In doing so, he refers to *Böhmer*, Liber Genesis Pentateuchicus, 1860, and to *Knobel's* Commentary on the Pentateuch. His scheme for the first four books is as follows:—

Elohist.—Genesis—i. 1–ii. 3, v. 1–28 as far as ויולד inclusive; ver. 29, נח; and vers. 30–32, vi. 9–22, vii. 6, 7; 8 as far as מן הבהמה, then from מן העוף; 9, 11; 13–16 as far as אלהים; 21, 24, viii. 1; 2 as far as השמים; 3 from ויחסרו; 4 from בחדש to לחדש; 5, 13–19, ix. 1, 17, 28, xi. 10–32, xii. 4 from ואברם; 5, xiii. 6; 11 from ויפרדו; 12 to הככר inclusive, xv. 1, xvi. 3; 15 from ויקרא; 16, xvii., xix. 29, xxi. 2 to שרה inclusive, then from למועד to the end of 2; 4, 5, xxiii., xxv. 7–11 to בנו inclusive; 17, 20; 26 from ויצחק, xxvi. 26–33 to שבעה; 34, 35, xxviii. 1–9, xxxi. 18, xxxv. 9 (except עוד)—15; 27, ויבא יעקב אל יצחק אביו קרית הארבע הוא חברון; 28, 29, xxxvi. 6 (except אל ארץ); 7, 8, xxxvii. 1, xlvi. 6, 7, xlvii. 11, ויתן להם אחזה בארץ מצרים; 27 from ויאחזו; 28, xlviii. 3–7, xlix. 29–33 to בניו, then from וימת, l. 12, 13. Exodus—i. 1–7, 13, 14, ii. 23 partly; 24, 25, vi. 2–7, 9–30, vii. 8–13, 19–22, viii. 1–3; 11 partly; 12–15, ix. 8–12, 35, xi. 9, 10, xii. 1–23, 28, 37*a*, 40–51, xiii. 1, 2, 20, xiv. 1–4, 8, 9, 17, 18, 21–23, 26; 27 partly; 28, 29, xv. 19, 22, 23, 27, xvi. 1, 2, 9–26, 31–36, xvii. 1, xix.

2*a*, xxv. 1–xxxi. 11, xxxv.–xl. Leviticus—i.–vii., viii.–x., xi.–xvi., xxi., xxii., xxiii., xxiv. 1–9, xxv. 1–17, 23–25, xxvii. Numbers—i.–iii., iv. 1–16, 21–49, v., vi. 1–21, vii., viii. 1–22, ix., x. 1–28, xiii. 1–17*a*, 21, 25, 26, 32, 33, xiv. 2*a*, 5–7, 10*b*, 34, 36–38, xv. 1–16, xvi. 1–11, 16–24, 35, xvii. 1–5, 6–26, xviii., xix., xx. 1 partly; 2, 6, 22–29, xxi. 10, 11, xxii. 1, xxv. 6–18, xxvi.–xxxi., xxxii. 1, 2, 16–19, 24, 28–30, 33–38, xxxiii.–xxxvi.

YOUNGER ELOHIST.—Genesis—xvi. 2; 15 to בן, xx. 1–17, xxi. 1; ותלד לאברהם בן לזקניו in 2; 3, 6, 7; 10–17 to קול הנער, then from ויאמר to end of 17; 18–20 to ויגדל; 21–34, xxii. 1–13, 19, xxv. 11 from וישב to the end of the verse, xxvi. 6, 13, 14 to רבה inclusive, 16, 17, 19–22, 25 to אהלו, xxviii. 10–12, 17–22, xxxi. 2, 4–9; 11 to בחלום inclusive; 13–17 to יעקב inclusive; 19 to צאנו; 20; 23 from וידבק; 24, 26, 28, 29; 31 partly; 38–41 to עבדתיך, then from ותחלף to 42 inclusive; 46, 47, 51; 52 except additions; 53 from וישבע; 54 to לחם inclusive, xxxii. 1 from וילך to ינשק; 2, 3; 23 from ויעבר; 25 from ויאבק; 27–32 to פנואל, xxxvi. 2–5, 11–14; 19, הוא אדום; 20–28, xxxvii. 3 to הוא לו; 4–10; 11 from ואביו; 12–14 to דבר, then from ויבא; 15–18 to מרחק; 19–22 to בו; 23 to אחיו; 24; 28 to הבור; 29–31; 32, ויביאו אל אביהם; 33 from כתנת to אכלתהו; 35 from ויבך; 36 (except פוטיפר), xl. (except what is in the Redactor), xli. 1 to והנה; 5 from שבע to 14, יוסף; 15, 16; 17 to יוסף; 22–24, הטבות; 25 to אל פרעה, then from את; 26 from שבע שבלים to הנה; 27 from ושבע השבלים; 34 to על הארץ; 35 to האלה, then אכל בערים; 39 to יוסף; 40 to ביתי; 42 from וילבש, 43, 45, 48, 50–52, 54 from ויהי, xlii. 6 from ויבאו; 7 from וידבר; 8, 9 (except מרגלים אתם), 10, 12, 21–23, xlv. 2, 3, xlvi. 8–12 to וזרח; 13–27, xlviii. 1 from ויאמר; 2; 10 to לראות; 13, 14, 20, xlix. 33, ויאסף—המטה, l. 22 to אביו. Exodus—i. 8–12, 15–22, ii. 1–10, iii., iv. 18, 27, 28*a*, 29, 30*a*, 31, xii. 24, 27, 35, 36, xiii. 3–19, 21, 22, xv. 1–18, 20, 21, 24–26, xvii. 2–16, xviii. (except 2*b*). Leviticus—xvii.–xx., xxvi., xxiv. 10–23, xxv. 18–22, xxvi. Numbers—iv. 17–20, viii. 23–26, xiii. 22–24, 27–31, xv. 22–30.

JEHOVIST.—Genesis—ii. 4–9, ובתוך הגן עץ הדעת טוב ורע, למאכל; 10–25, iii. 1–21, iv. 1–26, vi. 4 to ההם; 5–8, vii. 1–5, 10, 12, 16 from ויסגר; 17, 22, 23, viii. 2 from ויכלא; 3 to ושוב; 4, the words ותנח התבה על הרי אררט; 6–12, 20–22, ix. 18 as far as ויפת; 19, x. 1–4; 5 to בארצתם, then from למשפחתם to 8 נמרד; 9–20 to למשפחתם, then from בארצתם; 21, 22–25 to פלג, then from ושם to 31 למשפחתם, 31 from בארצתם; 32, xii. 1–4 as far as לוט, 6–20, xiii. 1–5, 7–11 to מקדם; 12 from ויאהל; 13–18, xiv., xv. 2, etc., xvi. 1, 4–14, xviii., xix. 1–28, xx. 18, xxi. 20 from וישב, xxii. 14–18, 20–24, xxiv. 1–67 to ויאהבה inclusive, xxv. 1–6, 12–16, 18, 19, 21–26 to יעקב, 27, 28, xxvii.

1–45, xxix., xxx. 1–13, 17–40 to יעקב, then from וישת to the end, xxxi. 1, 3; 17 from וישא; 19 from ותגנב; 21–23 to ימים inclusive; 25; 26 to יעקב; 27, 30; 31 to לבן; 50 from אין; 53 to אביהם; 54, last two words, xxxii. 1 to ובבקר, וישב למקומו; 4–22; 23 from ויקח to ילדיו; 24 from ויעבירם, xxxiii. 1–16; 18 to שכם, from ויחן; 20, xxxiv. 1 to ליעקב; 2 to הארץ; 3, 4, 6; 8–13 to וידברו; 14–18, 20–26 to חרב; 28–30, xxxv. 5; 16 from ויהי—20 קברתה; 21, 27; then ויבא יעקב ממרא אשר גר; xxxvi. 9, 10, 15–18 to יעלם, then אלה, etc.; 19 to אלופיהם; 31–43, xxxvii. 2; 3 from ועשה; 11 to אחיו; 18 from ויתנכלו; 23 from ויפשיטו; 25, 27; 28 from וימכרו to כסף; 32 (except ויביאו אל אביהם); 33 to ויאמר, then from טרף to the end; 34; 3 to שאלה; xxxviii., xxxix. (except what is in the Redactor), xli. 14, ויריצהו ויבא אל פרעה; 15 to חלמתי; 17 from בחלמי to 21; 25 to פרעה; 29, 31, 33; 34 from וחמש; 35 from ויצברו to פרעה; 36–39; 40 from ועל; 41; 42 to יוסף; 44, 46, 47, 49, 53; 54 to יוסף; 55–57, xlii. 1–5; 7 to וידבר אתם; 9 מרגלים אתם; 11, 13–20, 24, etc., xliii., xliv. 3–34, xlv. 1, 4–28, xlvi. 5 from וישאו; 28, etc., xlvii. 1–10; 11 into אחיו; בארץ—הארץ, then from כאשר; 12–27 into גשן, xlviii. 8, 9; 10 from וינש; 11; 12 from וישתחו; 15–19, 21, 22, xlix. 1–28, l. 15–21; 22 from ויחי; 23. Exodus—ii. 11–22, iv. 1–17, 19–26, v., vi. 8, vii. 14–18, 23–29, viii. 4–10; 11 partly; 16–28, ix. 1–7, 13–34, x. 1–29, xi. 1–8, xii. 29–34, 37*b*–39, xiv. 5–7, 10–14, 19, 20, 24, 25, 30, 31, xvi. 3–8, 27–30, xvii. 2–16, xix. 1, 2*b*–25, xx.–xxiii., xxiv., xxxi. 12–18, xxxii.–xxxiv., with materials from the Junior Elohist incorporated. Leviticus—x. 16–20. Numbers—vi. 22–27, x. 29–36, xi. 1–35, xii. 1–15, xiii. 16, xiv. 1, 2*b*, 3, 4, 8–10*a*, 11–33, 35; 39–45, xv. 17–21, xvi. 12–15, 25–34, xx. 1 partly; 3–5, 7–21, xxi. 1–3; 4 partly; 9, 12, 13, 14*b*, 15, 16, 17*b*, 18*b*–35, xxii. 2–xxiv. 25, xxv. 1–5, xxxii. 3–15, 20–23, 25–27, 31, 32, 39–42.

REDACTOR.—Genesis—ii. 9, ועץ החיים, iii. 22–24, v. 28, בן; 29 except נח, vi. 1–3; 4 from וגם, vii. 8 from הטהורה to טהורה, ix. 18 from וחם; 20–27, x. 5 איש ללשנו; 8 from הוא; 20 ללשנתם; 21; 25 from כי to הארץ; 31, ללשנתם, xi. 1–9, xix. 30, etc., xxi. 8, 9; 17 from ויקרא to השמים, xxiv. 67 וינחם יצחק אחרי אמו, xxv. 26 the names of the Elohist left out; 29–31; xxvi. 1–5, 7–12; 14 from ויקנאו; 15, 18, 23, 24; 25 from ויכרו, xxvii. 46, xxviii. 13–16, xxx. 14–16; 40 from ויתן to לבן, xxxi. 10; 11 from יעקב; 12, 18; 23 בהר הגלעד; 41 from ארבע to בצאנך; 48 from הגל to 50 על בנתי; 51 והנה המצבה; 52 ועדה המצבה and ואת המצבה; also the Redactor has made several minor omissions, xxxii. 23 from ויקם—הוא; 24 ויקחם; 25 לברו; 26; 32 from והוא, 33, xxxiii. 17; 18 from אשר to ארם, 19, xxxiv. 1 from לראות; 2 from ויקח; 5, 7; 13 from אשר; 19; 26 from ויקחו; 27, 31, xxxv.

1–4; 7 from ובברחו; 8; 9 עוד; 16 to אל; 20 from הוא; 27 ויבא יעקב omitted, xxxvi. 1; 2 בת צבעון; 6 אל ארץ; 9; 18 אלוף קרח; 29, 30, xxxvii. 14 from וישלחהו to חברון; 18 ובטרם יקרב אליהם; 22 from למען; 36 פוטיפר, xxxix. 1 from סרים to הטבחים; 20 from מקום to המלך, xl. 3 from אל; 5 from ובבית; 7 אתו; 15 from וגם, xli. 1 from עמד to 5 והנה; 14 from מן to שמלתיו; 15*a* something omitted; 22 ו at the beginning; 24 from ואמר; 25 something left out, חלום פרעה אחד הוא; 26 what is not in the Younger Elohist; 27*a*, 32; 39 something omitted, xlii. 6 to עם הארץ; 7 וידבר once omitted, xliv. 1, 2, xlvi. 1–5 to שבע; 12 from ויטת, xlvii. 29, etc., xlviii. 1 to האלה; 5 כראובן ושמעון; 12 to וברכיו, xlix. 28 from ויברך; 29 אותם instead of את בניו, l. 1–11, 14, 24–26. Exodus—ii. 23 partly, iv. 28*b*, 30*b*, vi. 1, yii. 1–6, x. 12 partly; 15 partly; xiv. 15, 16; 27 partly, xviii. 2*b*. Leviticus—none. Numbers —xii. 16, xiii. 17*b*–20, xiv. 1 partly, xvi. 27*b*, xvii. 27, 28, xxi. 4 partly; 14*a*, 17*a*, 27*a*, xxxii. 1 partly; 29 partly. *Davidson's* tables, from which these are taken, extend over only the first four books. But from pp. 391–3 we learn that he assigns Deuteronomy as a whole to a different author: only he makes ch. xxxi. 14–30 Jehovistic; xxxii. 1–43 a song by some poet; vers. 44–47 Deuteronomist; vers. 48–52 Elohist; ch. xxxiii. an unknown writer; xxxiv. 1–9 Elohistic, yet vers. 4–6, 10 Jehovistic; vers. 11, 12, Deuteronomist.

Vaihinger, the author of the article Pentateuch in *Herzog's* Encyclopædia, distributes the composition among three writers, whom he names the Vor-Elohist, the Elohist, and the Jehovist; the second of these being the Fundamental Document, or Book of Origins and Laws; the first being the Book of Covenants and National Histories, or the First Supplementary Document; and the third being the Book of Tribal Histories and Divine Miracles, or the Second Supplementary Document. See *Herzog*, xi. pp. 335–6.

Vor-Elohist.	Elohist.	Jehovist.
	Gen. i. 1-ii. 4*a*.	Gen. ii. 4*b*-iv. 26.
	Gen. v. 1-32.	Gen. vi. 1-8.
	Gen. vi. 9-22.	Gen. vii. 1-5, 10, 16*b*, 23*a*-viii. 7, 20-22, ix. 18-27.
	Gen. vii. 6-9, 11-16*a*, 17-22, 23*b*, viii. 1-3, middle of 4, 5, 6*b*, 8-19, ix. 1-17, 28, 29.	Gen. x. 8-12.
	Gen. x. 1-7, 13-32.	Gen. xi. 1-9.
(Gen. xi. 29, 30.)	Gen. xi. 10-32.	Gen. xii. 1-4*a*.
Gen. xii. 10-20.	Gen. xii. 5, 4*b*, 6*a*, 8*a*, 9.	Gen. xii. 6*b*, 7, 8*b* (10-20).
Gen. xiv. 1-24.	Gen. xiii. 2, 5, 6, 11*b*, 12-18*a* (xix. 29).	Gen. xiii. 1, 3, 4, 7-11*a*, 13-17, 18*b*.
Gen. xv. 1*b*, 2.	Gen. xv. 1*b* (?).	Gen. xv. 1*a*, 3-21.

Vor-Elohist.	Elohist.	Jehovist.
	Gen. xvi. 1, 3, 15, 16.	Gen. xvi. 2, 4-14.
Gen. xx. 1-17.	Gen. xvii. 1-27.	Gen. xviii. 1-xix. 28, 30-38.
Gen. xxi. 22-34 (vrs. 6-21).	Gen. xxi. 1-21.	Gen. xx. 18.
	Gen. xxii. 1-13, 19-24.	Gen. xxii. 14-18.
	Gen. xxiii. 1-19.	Gen. xxiv. 1-67.
	Gen. xxv. 1-20, 21*c*, 24-34.	Gen. xxv. 21*ab*, 22, 23.
(Gen. xxvi. 1, 26-33.)	Gen. xxvi. 6, 12-23, 34, 35.	Gen. xxvi. 1-5, 7-11, 24-33.
	Gen. xxvii. 46.	Gen. xxvii. 1-45.
	Gen. xxviii. 1-12, 16*a*, 17-22,	Gen. xxviii. 13-15, 16*b*.
(Gen. xxix. 1-xxxiii. 17.)	Gen. xxix. 1-xxxii. 3 (fundamentally).	(Gen. xxix. 1-xxxii. 3, in some parts.)
Gen. xxxii. 4-22, xxxiii. 1-16.	Gen. xxxii. 23-33, xxxiii. 17-20.	
(Gen. xxxv. 1-4, 6-8, 16-22.)	Gen. xxxiv. 1-31.	
	Gen. xxxv. 1-29.	
	Gen. xxxvi. 1-43.	
Gen. xxxvii. 28*a*, 36.	Gen, xxxvii. 1-22, 28*bcd*, 29-35.	(Gen. xxxvii. 23-27, 28*c*) (?).
		Gen. xxxviii. 1-30.
	Gen. xxxix. 1, 2*b*, 7-20.	Gen. xxxix. 2*a*, 3-6, 21-23.
	Gen. xl. 1-xlv. 28.	
(Gen. xlvi. 28-30, or 28-34.)	Gen. xlvi. 1-xlvii. 31.	
Gen. xlviii. 22.	Gen. xlviii. 3-7, 1, 2, 8-21.	
Gen. xlix. 3-28*ab*.	Gen. xlix. 1, 2, 28*c*-33.	
Gen. l. 24-26.	Gen. l. 1-23.	
Ex. iii. 21, 22.	Ex. i. 1-ii. 25.	Ex. iii. 1-9, 16-20.
Ex. iv. 24-26.	Ex. iv. 19, iii. 10-15, iv. 18, 20*ab* (21*b*).	Ex. iv. 1-17, 21-23, 27-31 (20*c*).
	Ex. vi. 2-vii. 13.	Ex. v. 1-vi. 1.
	Ex. vii. 19-22.	Ex. vii. 14-18.
	Ex. viii. 1-3.	Ex. vii. 23-25, 26-29.
	Ex. viii. 12-15.	Ex. viii. 4-11.
	Ex. ix. 8-12.	Ex. viii. 16-28.
(Ex. ix. 35.) (?)	Ex. ix. 35.	Ex. ix. 1-7.
Ex. x. 12-20, fundamentally, as ver. 27.	Ex. x. 27-29.	Ex. ix. 13-34.
	Ex. xi. 4-8.	Ex. x. 1-20.
Ex. xi. 2, 3,	Ex. xi. 9, 10.	Ex. x. 21-xi. 3.
Ex. xii. 35, 36.	Ex. xii. 1-24, 28.	Ex. xii. 25-27.
	Ex. xii. 29, 37, 38, 40-42.	Ex. xii. 30-36, 39.
Ex. xiii. 17-19.	Ex. xii. 43-51.	Ex. xiii. 5-9.
	Ex. xiii. 1-4.	Ex. xiii. 10-16.
Ex. xiv. 5-7.	Ex. xiii. 20.	Ex. xiii. 21, 22.
Ex. xv. 1-19, 24-26.	Ex. xiv. 1-4, 8, 9, 19-31.	Ex. xiv. 10-14, 15*b*, 16-18.
	Ex. xv. 20-23, 27.	(Ex. xv. 24-26.)
	Ex. xvi. 1, 2, 9-17, 21-26, 31-36.	Ex. xvi. 3-8, 18-20, 27-30.

Vor-Elohist.	Elohist.	Jehovist.
Ex. xvii. 9-16, fundamentally.	Ex. xvii. 1, 8.	Ex. xvii. 2-7, 9-16.
Ex. xviii. 1-27.		Ex. xix. 9, 19-25.
Ex. xix. 3-8, 10-18, xx. 1-xxiv. 18.	Ex. xix. 1, 2, 3-6 (?), xxiv. 15-17 (?).	
	Ex. xxv. 1-xxxi. 17, 18.	
Ex. xxxii. 1-xxxiv. 35, fundamentally.	Ex. xxxv. 1-Lev. xxvii. 34.	(Lev. xxvi. 3-45.)
Lev. xviii. 1-30, fundamentally.	Num. i. 1-x. 28.	
Num. x. 29-36.		
Num. xi. 1-xii. 16, fundamentally.	Num. xi. 1-xii. 16.	Num. xi. 1-xii. 16, wrought up.
	Num. xiii. 1-xx. 13.	
Num. xx. 14-21.	Num. xx. 22-29.	
Num. xxi. 1-9, 13-35.	Num. xxi. 10-12, xxii. 1.	Num. xxii. 2-xxiv. 25.
	Num. xxv. 1-xxxi. 54.	Num. xxxi. 8*b*.
Num. xxxii. 33-42.	Num. xxxii. 1-32.	
Num. xxxiii. 55, 56.	Num. xxxiii. 1-xxxvi. 19.	
	Deut. xxxii. 48-52, xxxiv. 1-9.	Deut. xxxiv. 10-12.

If any one wishes to study the subject in his Hebrew Bible for himself, perhaps no way will be found at once so easy and so thorough as to conceive of the existing Pentateuch as if it were the result of successive deposits or strata, and to paint them with different colours, as the geologist paints the successive deposits or strata on his map. For instance, let him leave the fundamental document untouched with the natural whiteness of the paper. Let him give a blue tint to the Jehovist, and a yellow tint to the Vor-Elohist of *Vaihinger*, or the Younger Elohist of *Davidson* (for these will be found to have much in common); and let him reserve the red, which is sorer on the eyes, for the rarer work of the Redactor. Immediately the composition of the Pentateuch, according to the critical school, will stand out distinctly before him. In doing this with these two tables, he will find a few difficulties more or less perplexing, probably owing to errors in writing out so many confusing numbers.]

Yet "the original plan and connection" of the fundamental document many a time cannot be discovered, after we have separated the portions allotted to it from those which are derived from the supplementer. It is an erroneous assertion on the part of *Tuch*, that the supplementer alone goes back upon the other document as well as his own, and assumes its existence, whereas the fundamental document makes no references except to itself. On the contrary, its narratives

many a time refer us back to sections by the supplementer, and necessarily presuppose these if they are themselves to be understood: otherwise they form a book disfigured by gaps, destitute of plan or connection, and unintelligible (2). Nor has criticism succeeded in proving that the fundamental document is a connected whole, in spite of its liberal application of cheap palliatives, when it has pronounced some passages to have been interpolated and others to have been wrought up by a later hand.

(2) *Gaps* in the fundamental document in *Genesis*:—Between ii. 3 and v. 1 ff.: for without the fall the corruption of all flesh throughout the world (vi. 11–13) becomes a riddle, since God had created everything good, and very good (i. 9, 12, 18, 21, 25, 31); and even the origin of the theocracy becomes inconceivable. Comp. *Welte*, Nachmos. p. 157 ff.; *Kurtz*, Beitrr. i. p. 69 ff.—Between v. 32 and vi. 9; since without vi. 1–8 there is no cause whatever assigned for the universality of the corruption (even of the Sethites) and of the flood. Comp. *Kurtz*, Einh. d. Genes. § 35 f.—Between vi. 22 and vii. 11 there is wanted a divine communication as to the time when the flood should commence, for this is indispensable to an orderly representation of the events. Comp. *Kurtz*, p. 51 ff. [*Vaihinger*, however, gives vii. 6–9 to the Elohist, which somewhat lessens the difficulty on his scheme.]—Between xvii. 1 ff. and xi. 32, or xii. 8, or xiii. 18; since ch. xvii. presupposes earlier revelations of God to Abram, as well as the relation between Abram and Hagar which is described in ch. xvi. Comp. *Kurtz*, p. 88 ff. [*Bleek*, p. 266, thinks that as the Jehovist advanced, there was more and more a working up of his materials; and that there was an Elohistic foundation for ch. xvi. *Vaihinger* has similar opinions.]—Between xvii. 27 and xix. 29, so that this latter notice, when left in the fundamental document, becomes quite a riddle. Comp. *Kurtz*, p. 99 f. [To avoid this, *Vaihinger* transposes xix. 29, and places it immediately after xiii. 18.]—Between xxii. 13 and ver. 19; since without vers. 14–18 the narrative is abrupt, and destitute of any proper conclusion. Comp. *Kurtz*, p. 114. —Between xxv. 20 and ver. 24, where the gap is concealed only by capriciously patching on ver. 21*b*. Comp. *Kurtz*, p. 147 f.—Between xxviii. 12 and ver. 17 ff.; since the latter verses, especially ver. 21, presuppose a theophany, and not merely an angelophany. [*Vaihinger* escapes from this difficulty by replying that these are reckoned to be the same; and he appeals to Ex. iii. 2, 4, Judg. xiii. 20, 22, 23,—a statement and proof passages which will have no weight with those

who believe in the divinity of "the Angel of Jehovah."]—Between xxx. 23 and xxxi. 4 ff.; since no explanation can be given of Jacob's receiving wages from Laban (xxxi. 7 ff.), and of his serving Laban for twenty years (vers. 38–41), instead of fourteen as had been settled, xxix. 15–30. Comp. *Kurtz*, p. 164 f. [*Vaihinger* meets this by asserting that the groundwork of the entire narrative is Elohistic.] —Between xxxvii. 36 and xxxix. 5, from which it remains inconceivable how and why the wretched slave Joseph comes to be in such favour with Potiphar, as to be entrusted with the management of all his house. [*Vaihinger* denies that there was any such favour, assigning xxxix. 2*a* to the Jehovist, like xxiv. 40, 42, 56, xxxix. 3, 23.]

In *the three intermediate books* there is a great gap between Ex. ii. 25 and vi. 2, since we cannot conceive why vi. 2 should commence without introduction or adjustment, "And God spake unto Moses;" or more strikingly still, ver. 13, "And the Lord spake unto Moses and unto Aaron, and gave them a charge unto the children of Israel, and unto Pharaoh king of Egypt" (comp. also ver. 12). For it is not the manner of the fundamental document to presuppose our acquaintance with two men of such great historical importance, of whom nothing has previously been said; and then subsequently to give their genealogy for the first time. And where then did God previously give Aaron a charge to the children of Israel, or give Moses one to Pharaoh? Only in the supplementer's narrative, ch. iii. and iv. [*Vaihinger* meets this by assigning iv. 19, iii. 10–15, iv. 18, 20, except the last third of it, to the Elohist, placing these verses in the order here given, and also transposing vi. 13–28 to stand after vii. 7.]—Between vii. 7 and xii. 1 ff. there is an immense chasm, since vii. 3, belonging to the fundamental document, announces the hardening of Pharaoh's heart, and the multiplication of God's signs and wonders in Egypt; and even if (with *De Wette*) we arbitrarily set this verse aside as an interpolation, ver. 4 announces great judgments by means of which God will bring His people out of Egypt; but of the ordaining of all this the document says not a word. [*Vaihinger* meets this difficulty by assigning several intermediate portions, including the narrative of *five* plagues, to the Elohist.]—Between xii. 28 and ver. 37, where, after the excision of vers. 29–36 and ver. 39, the document knows nothing of the destruction of the first-born of the Egyptians, which had been announced in vers. 12 and 23; and the exodus, and the passover with its name and its peculiar rites, become an incomprehensible riddle. [*Vaihinger* meets this by giving ver. 29 to the Elohist.]—Between xii. 51, "And it came to pass the

self-same day, that the Lord did bring the children of Israel out of the land of Egypt by their armies," and xvi. 1, "And they took their journey from Elim," etc., there is a leap for which no preparation has been made; nor is this avoided, although (with *De Wette*) we leave xiii. 17–20 to the fundamental document: for at xiii. 20 Israel encamps at Etham, at the edge of the wilderness on the Egyptian side of the Red Sea, and at xvi. 1 they journey from Elim on the other side of it. [*Vaihinger* meets this by giving several intermediate passages to the Elohist.]—Between xvi. 36, where Israel was encamped in the wilderness of Sin, between Elim and Sinai, and xix. 1 compared with ver. 2, and Num. xxxiii. 11–15, according to which they journey from Rephidim and pitch at Sinai: this gap is made more serious, instead of being filled up, in case (with *De Wette*) we attribute ch. xviii. to the fundamental document, on account of "the Elohistic colouring of vers. 13–17;" as this chapter is full of references to the plagues of Egypt and the wonderful redemption of Israel (vers. 1, 8–11), of which the fundamental document is said to know nothing. [See above, as to *Vaihinger* inserting some account of the plagues.]—Between xix. 1 and xx. 1, "And God spake all these words;" for in this latter there is presupposed a revelation from God of which the document tells us nothing.—Finally, between xx. 14, the end of the ten commandments [otherwise numbered ver. 17, as in the Eng. ver.], and the passage xxv. 1–xxxi. 17 (the ordinances for constructing the tabernacle and arranging the whole service of God), we want the account of Israel being accepted as the peculiar people of Jehovah; in the absence of which there is no assignable motive for erecting a tabernacle in which God might dwell among His people, nor any for a priesthood and a divine service at all. [*Vaihinger* admits the existence of this difficulty, yet he thinks there are Elohistic portions (xix. 3–6, xxiv. 15–17) between xix. 2 and xxv. 1; besides which, he says, the Elohist may have abridged some things on account of the large portion which he has inserted from the Vor-Elohist.]—Further, between Num. xiii. 17 and xx. 1 there lies a great chasm, at the place where the reader finds himself transported unawares from the encampment in Paran to Kadesh in the wilderness of Zin, and from the second year of the exodus to the first month of the fortieth year; and this without learning the result of the mission of the spies, or the reason of the forty years of wandering in the wilderness, and of the death of the generation which came out of Egypt. [*Vaihinger*, however, assigns the whole of the intermediate passage to the Elohist.]—Between xx. 13 and ver. 22 there is a gap, on account of which we are unable to conceive why Israel should move *backwards* to Mount

Hor again (ver. 22), and from that should journey away to the Red Sea, on purpose to make a circuit round the land of Edom (xxi. 4). [*Vaihinger* says that the difficulty is dependent upon the erroneous supposition that xx. 1 refers to the fortieth year; whereas he makes the blank of thirty-eight years subsequent to this, and not anterior to it. Indeed, he is inclined to a conjectural alteration of Num. xxxiii. 38, so as to place the death of Aaron in the *fourth* year of the exodus, instead of the *fortieth*.]—Between xx. 29 and xxv. 1, Israel is transported at a leap from Mount Hor to Shittim; or to the plains of Moab, if (like *Stähelin*) we assign xxii. 1 to the fundamental document. [*Vaihinger* meets this by assigning both xxi. 10–12 and xxii. 1 to the Elohist.]

The following *references* from the fundamental document back to sections written by the supplementer occur in *Genesis*:—v. 29 to iii. 17; not to be set aside by the favourite resource of an interpolation at v. 29; comp. *Kurtz*, Beitrr. p. 129 f.: v. 3 to iv. 25; comp. *Kurtz*, p. 132 [*Vaihinger* denies that there is an allusion]: xvii. 20 to xvi. 10: xix. 29 to xiii. 10–13, xviii. 17–32, and xix. 1–25; comp. *Kurtz*, Einheit d. Gen. ii. p. 101 ff. [*Vaihinger* meets this by transposing xviii. 29 to stand immediately after xiii. 18*a*]: xxi. 9 to xvi. 15 [which latter, however, is Elohistic, according to *Vaihinger*]; and xxii. 19 to xxi. 33 [*Vaihinger* replies that Beersheba is named by the Elohist in xxi. 14, and that between this verse and xvii. 27 the account of Abraham journeying to it may have fallen out!]: xxiii. 4, 6, presuppose a tolerably long residence on the part of Abraham in the neighbourhood of Hebron, of which nothing is related in the fundamental document, but only by the supplementer; comp. *Kurtz*, p. 116 [*Vaihinger* says that the *earlier* residence of Abraham at Hebron is mentioned by the Elohist at xiii. 18*a*]: xxviii. 20, 21 to ver. 15 [*Vaihinger* denies this]: xxxii. 10*b* and ver. 13 to xxxi. 3, and xxxii. 13 to xxviii. 14, compared with xxii. 17, where it is vain to have recourse to "an interpolation;" while xxx. [? xxviii.] 4–12 presupposes the account of Esau losing the birthright by subtilty, which is found in the supplementer alone; comp. *Kurtz*, p. 167 f.: xxxv. 1–3, 7, to the theophany at Bethel, related at xxviii. 13–16: xl. 4 to xxxix. 21–23: xlvi. 12 to xxxviii. 7–10 [not necessarily, *Vaihinger* replies]: xlix. 8 and 10 to xxvii. 29 and 40; comp. *Kurtz*, p. 199.

The gaps in the fundamental document become still more numerous, as well as its references to the narratives of the supplementer, if we test *Stähelin's* division of the sections, as *Kurtz*, *ibid.*, has shown. [On the other hand, the reader has noticed how *Vaihinger* replies to *Keil*, and saves himself from several of the difficulties. It

is always to be recollected how easily this can be done by any critic who has a list of such difficulties before him, and who has sufficient coolness to make his escape from them, by assigning the passages differently to the different imaginary authors, entirely unembarrassed in this procedure by any restraints to his caprice or subjective taste. Among other consequences, however, it will be found that this course of procedure tends very much to enlarge the amount of matter conceded to the original document.] Such *references* in the *intermediate books* are the following:—Ex. xxv.–xxxi. (the ordinances for the tabernacle, the priesthood, and the divine service) presuppose, at xxv. 9, 40, xxvi. 30, and xxvii. 8, a meeting of Moses with Jehovah upon Mount Sinai, which is related only by the supplementer, xix. 2–25, xx. 15–23, xxiv. 1–18 (and xxxi. 18). Lev. xxv. 1, xxvi. 46, and xxvii. 34, refer to Ex. xx. 21–xxiv. 18, and xxxi. 18–xxxiv. 28: for Lev. xxv. is only the expansion of Ex. xxiii. 10, 11, and xxxiv. 21–23, where the appointment of the seasons for rest in Israel is briefly made; and Lev. xxvi. is but the detailed statement of Ex. xxiii. 20–23: comp. also Lev. xxvi. 1 with Ex. xxxiv. 17, and Lev. xxvi. 2 with Ex. xxv. 8 [?]. Lev. xxiv. 10–16 assumes that the prohibition of blaspheming the name of Jehovah (Ex. xxii. 27) was already given, and was well known. Num. iii. 13 refers to Ex. xii. 29, 30 [ver. 29, however, being Elohistic, according to *Vaihinger*], and Num. xv. 20 ("as the heave-offering of the threshing-floor") to Ex. xxiii. 19. Num. xvi. 3 ("seeing all the congregation are holy") is based upon Ex. xix. 6. Num. xvii. 16–28 implies that not only Korah's faction among the Levites, but also some people in other tribes, had made pretensions to the priesthood; and it refutes the hypothesis of *Stähelin* and *De Wette* (which indeed is wrecked upon xvi. 3), that the original narrative had to do only with Korah and his faction, with which the supplementer mixed up the insurrection of Dathan and Abiram. Num. xviii. 12, 13, presupposes the ordinances, Ex. xxii. 28 and xxiii. 19. Num. xx. 1 implies that Miriam is already known from Ex. xv. 20, 21 [which is Elohistic, however, according to *Vaihinger*]; on which account *Stähelin* assumes that Num. xx. 1 contains a later addition. Num. xxvi. 65 refers to Num. xiv. 24 and 38 [which, however, are both Elohistic, according to *Vaihinger*]. Num. xxxi. 8, 16, presuppose Num. xxii.–xxiv., yet cannot proceed from the Jehovist, since they are said to contradict those chapters. '[Accordingly *Vaihinger* says, either ch. xxii.–xxiv. must be assigned to the Elohist,—a proceeding of which he disapproves; or else what is said of Balaam in xxxi. 8, 16 must be interpolations of the harmonist,—a most useful functionary in these hypotheses, though it does seem

strange to attribute contradictions to *him.*] Num. xxxii. 4 and 33 presuppose the narrative of the conquest in xxi. 21–35. Num. xxxiii. 9 refers to Ex. xv. 27; Num. xxxiii. 15 to Ex. xvii. 1; Num. xxxiii. 16, 17, to Num. xi.; and Num. xxxiii. 40 to Num. xxi. 1–3.

§ 25. *The Basis of the Hypothesis of Supplements. The Divine Names.*

From the constant use of the divine names *Elohim* and *Jehovah* respectively, in certain sections of Genesis, and from Ex. vi. 2, 3, it has been inferred that the author of "the fundamental document," or "first legislation" (*Stähelin*), entirely avoided the name Jehovah until the revelation of it, of which he gives the account in Ex. vi.; but that thenceforward he made use of it continually, using Elohim only as an appellative. On the contrary, the two names are said to be used promiscuously from the beginning in the passages interpolated by the "supplementer," or the pieces belonging to the "second legislation" (1). But these divine names cannot be used as proofs of the diversity of authorship. For when Ex. vi. 2, 3 is rightly understood, it does not assert that the name Jehovah was first revealed in the time of Moses (2). Nor can we obtain continuous narratives in Genesis, according as the one or the other of these names is used (3). Nay, much rather, these two names are interchanged only in accordance with the difference of meaning which they suggested to the religious consciousness of the Israelites, and are everywhere used rightly and suitably to the subjects dealt with in the several passages (4).

(1) So *Tuch*, *Stähelin*, *De Wette*, [*Bleek*], *von Lengerke*, *Knobel*, etc. Against it compare *Keil's* Abhandlung über die Gottesnamen im Pentateuch, in the Zeitschrift f. luther. Theologie u. Kirche of *Rudelbach* u. *Guericke*, 1851, pp. 215–280.

(2) The passage Ex. vi. 2, 3, "I am Jehovah: and I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, by the name of God Almighty; but by my name Jehovah was I not known unto them," does not treat of the promulgation of the name Jehovah, but of the revelation of God in the attributes of Jehovah. Comp. *Kurtz*, Einheit d. Genes. p. xxix. ff.; *Keil*, *ibid.* p. 221 ff., note 1; and also *Delitzsch*, Genes. i. p. 35. Moreover, the revelation of God to Moses there recorded does not declare that this was the epoch at

which אלהים became יהוה in the consciousness which the Israelites had of God; nor does it pronounce anything as to the historical origin and the mutual relation of these two names, since Jehovah is there opposed, not to Elohim, but to El-Shaddai. But, with a reference to Gen. xvii., it treats only of a twofold form of the revelation of Elohim; on the one hand as *El-Shaddai*, and on the other as *Jehovah*: these, however, not being mutually exclusive, but the one implicitly presupposing the other. For *El-Shaddai* designates only one operating force in the manifestation of Jehovah—namely, creative omnipotence —in which Jehovah made Himself known to the patriarchs till the time of Moses, when, in consequence of the full realization of His promises given to the fathers, His nature as Jehovah unfolded itself fully. Also Ex. iii. 13–15 does not assert that prior to Moses the Israelites as yet had or knew no name for God; it treats exclusively of the deduction from certain premisses of the true *meaning* of the name יהוה (comp. *Hofmann*, Schriftbeweis, Nördl. 1852, Th. i. p. 83). The name Jehovah is much older than the time of Moses. Its earlier origin is proved in various ways: (1.) Because the word is formed from the ancient root הוה, which in the Mosaic age was already supplanted in the living language by היה, and is retained in the Pentateuch in a few forms only as an archaism. (2.) Because in earlier times proper names occur in which it is an element: as יוֹכֶבֶד, the mother of Moses, Ex. vi. 20, Num. xxvi. 59 (comp. *Ewald*, Gesch. ii. p. 148); אֲחִיָּה, 1 Chron. ii. 25; אֲבִיָּה, a grandson of Benjamin's, 1 Chron. vii. 8; בִּתְיָה, a daughter of Pharaoh's, and the wife of Mered, 1 Chron. iv. 18; and מִרְיָה, Gen. xxii. 2, compounded of a *Hophal* participle and the shortened form of Jehovah. (3.) It is improbable that, without further remark, Moses should have so far antedated a name just come into use for the first time, and should have interpolated it in utterances which had been handed down by tradition, like the blessing of Noah (Gen. ix. 26), and that of Jacob (Gen. xlix. 18); or, again, in the very ancient proverbial sayings, Gen. x. 9, xxii. 14. [The only plausible objection to the antiquity of the name is its non-appearance as an element in proper names until the age of Samuel and David, when it becomes very common. At the utmost, however, this is nothing more than a singular circumstance, the explanation of which may or may not be easily given: while the existence of the names above mentioned is enough to show that the name was sometimes so compounded before the age of Moses; and there are also some examples of such composition among his contemporaries, and again among those who lived a little later. It is to be recollected also, that the infrequency of its use in proper names is not peculiar

to Jehovah; the same is the case with Shaddai (Zurishaddai, Ammishaddai), Num. ii. 12, 25, etc. The frequent use of Jehovah as an element in proper names is chiefly in deep-stirring times of conscious personal devotedness, the times of David, and again the times of those who continued faithful to the divinely-constituted kingdom in the hands of David's seed, when the ten tribes revolted. Precisely the same spirit, in similar circumstances, whatever error or superstition may be supposed by some to have mingled with the practice, led the English Puritans to give their children names out of the Old Testament which implied covenant relationship; as in pious Swabia the names Gottlieb, Gottfried, Gotthilf, are said to prevail as they do not in the rest of Germany. Moreover, among the modern Jews, who stand in a position very different from that occupied by their fathers before Christ came, names compounded with *Jehovah* are rare, though those with *El* are common enough.]

(3) The impossibility of dividing the entire book of Genesis into sections, according as the divine name used is Jehovah or Elohim, of which sections the Elohistic at least shall form a continuous document, is manifest from this, that there are comparatively few sections in which the one or the other occurs exclusively. (A.) *Elohim* alone occurs in ch. i.–ii. 3 (the creation of heaven and earth); xix. 29–38 (Lot's departure from Zoar, and settlement in the mountains of Edom); xxv. 1–11 (Abraham's last marriage, children, death, and burial); xxvii. 46–xxviii. 9 (Jacob's dismission from his father's house); and l. (Jacob's burial and Joseph's death). (B.) *Jehovah* alone in ch. x., xi. (table of the nations, confusion of tongues, Shem's genealogy); xii., xiii. (Abraham's journey to Canaan and Egypt); xxiv. (Rebekah engaged and brought to be the wife of Isaac); xxviii. 10–22 (Jacob's dream at Bethel); and xxxviii. (Judah's incest). (C.) The two names conjoined only in ch. ii. 4–iii. 24 (paradise and the fall); in fact, Jehovah-Elohim united twenty times, and Elohim alone three times; then alternating in ch. iv. (Adam's sons, Cain's fratricide, and his descendants). In all the other sections we find other names of God along with these: *Ha-Elohim* both in our Elohistic context (v. 22, 24, vi. 9, 11, etc.), and in a Jehovistic context (vi. 2, 4, xx. 17, xxvii. 28): in addition, *Adonai* only in addresses to God or conversations with God, in a Jehovistic context, xv. 2, 8, xviii. 3, 27, 30–32, xix. 18, and in one that is Elohistic, xx. 4: *El* in Genesis and Exodus only as an appellative, with various epithets to determine the conception more precisely,—as אֵל עֶלְיוֹן, xiv. 18–20, 22; אֵל עוֹלָם, xxi. 33; אֵל שַׁדַּי, xvii. 1, xxviii. 3, xxxv. 11, xlviii. 3; אֵל רֳאִי, xvi. 13; אֵל בֵּית־אֵל, xxxv. 7; אֵל אָבִיךָ, xlix. 25; אֵל אלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל,

xxxiii. 20, and others besides, not only in so-called Elohistic portions, like xiv. [?], xxviii., xxxi., xxxiii., xxxv., xliii., xlvi., and xlviii., but also in the Jehovistic portions, like xvi. 13, and in closest connection with Jehovah, xvii. 1 and xxi. 33.

(4) The name *Elohim*, not derived from אול (*Gesenius* [whose settled opinion rather seems to have been, that it is a primitive], *Tuch*, *Kurtz*, etc.), but from אָלַהּ = *aliha* in Arabic, "to be surprised, afraid" (*Hengstb.*, *Drechsler*, *Häv.*, *Hofmann*, *Delitzsch*, Genesis, ii. p. 171, etc.), is to be taken as a plural of majesty, expressive not of a mere respectful custom, but of the absolute fulness of the conception (and not as a plural of abstraction, with *Hofmann*, Schriftbeweis, i. p. 74). Thus rightly understood, it designates *the Supreme Being who is to be feared*, in whom there is the union of inexhaustible stores of divine forces and perfections. Consequently, in reference to heathendom, it is the external multiplicity of divine forces, or *the gods:* but in the theocratic idea of God, it is the Supreme Being, comprehensive of all divine perfection; partly in the more general sense of the Deity, the Creator, the Preserver, and the Governor of the world, partly in the higher sense of the absolute God, who has revealed Himself to the patriarchs and their descendants as *El-Shaddai* and *Jehovah*. [Nor need we hesitate to include in the plural form of the name a certain reference to that divine perfection, the plurality of persons in the Godhead.]

The name *Jehovah*, formed from the imperfect of הָוָה = הָיָה, "to exist," and probably to be pronounced יַהְוֶה or יְהְוֶה (comp. *P. Caspari*, üb. Micha den Morasthiten, p. 5 ff.) [*Delitzsch*, Genesis, p. 68, 3d ed., and Psalmen, 1st ed., pp. viii., ix., prefers יְהְוֶה as a noun], is a proper name. It does not designate God as Him who is to become, that is, who is coming into manifestation, the revelation of whose being (not His being itself) is conceived as in the act of taking place, which is the opinion of *Delitzsch*, *Baumgarten*, and *Kurtz;* but it designates Him as Him "who is, and still for ever is," to whom belongs existence for evermore. Yet as the existence of God is not one of doing nothing, but a living, working existence, He bears testimony to it, saying, "I am that I am" (Ex. iii. 14), who is the same throughout all ages, and who manifests Himself as being what He is (He that Himself exists in history, according to *Hofmann*, *ibid.* p. 81 f.): and so the personal and everlasting God, who gave Himself to be known by the patriarchs through promises rich in meaning, and stretching forward far into the future; and who realizes to their descendants these promises (the aim of which is the salvation of all nations) by setting up the covenant which had been concluded with

111882

their fathers, by which Jehovah became to Israel the God of revelation and the covenant God, and in this covenant the God of salvation. In this character He solemnly declares His eternal unchangeable existence (Mal. iii. 6), by keeping His promises given to the fathers inviolable; by carrying forward, with unalterable fidelity, to its appropriate termination the work of salvation for which these promises prepared the way; and in this course, by not only unfolding His essential character, which is grace and mercy, justice and holiness (Ex. xxxiv. 6, 7), but also by manifesting Himself as the God of the spirits of all flesh (Num. xvi. 22, xxvii. 16), who gives to His people "life and breath, and all things" (Acts xvii. 25).

Corresponding to this knowledge of Jehovah in name and essence, which was attained by means of the gradually progressive divine revelations, there is the fact that from Gen. i. to Ex. vi. 1 Elohim and Jehovah are used alternately; while from Ex. vi. 2 and onward Jehovah is so exclusively the designation for God, that Elohim is used along with it only as an appellative: it is used as a proper name only in mentioning matters which involve the mere general consciousness of God, apart from the specific theocratic sense; or else, in giving prominence to the existence of God in such a way as to guard against the abuse which would transform Jehovah into a mere national deity. For at Ex. vi. begins the full unfolding of God in His character of Jehovah, whilst the foundations of the theocracy are being laid by means of Moses. *Before* this epoch God had manifested Himself as Jehovah only in promises, able to realize these, because He is El-Shaddai, even if the forces and laws of nature should be insufficient (Gen. xvii.). Consequently in the *first* half of Genesis the name Jehovah appears only in narratives which stand in a determinate reference to the salvation which began to be revealed in the call of Abraham; whereas Elohim is used in all cases of common reference on God's part to the world and to creation. In the *second* half of Genesis, Jehovah is used only where God reveals Himself to the patriarchs in promises, and is so known and honoured by them: yet with this limitation, that after God as El-Shaddai had engaged to Abraham that He would establish the covenant He had concluded with him (Gen. xvii.), El-Shaddai is put instead of it, in the sense of the personal Almighty God; nay, Elohim is so used in common prose, and the name Jehovah is confined to the domain of the loftier style of language. According to this we explain the fact of the rarity of the name Jehovah in the latter part of Genesis, as compared with the history of Abraham: on the one hand, by the rarity of divine revelations during this period, in natural connection with

which the knowledge of God as Jehovah (especially in the guidance of Jacob's sons) retired into the background [for they had rejected and persecuted Joseph, and in doing so had entered on a course of backsliding, which put Jehovah and His covenant manifestations at a distance from them]; on the other hand, by the paraphrases of the concept Jehovah, which had been given in the revelations communicated to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob,—paraphrases which frequently occur in place of it.

This intelligible distinction of Elohim and Jehovah is firmly maintained throughout the entire Pentateuch, without any promiscuous use of the names; and it gives a complete and unforced explanation of the employment of the one name or the other in Genesis. This is shown by illustrating the whole collection of the passages in *Keil, ibid.* p. 231 ff.; *Häv.* Einl. i. 2, p. 80 ff. [The general argument, however, suffers no serious injury, should any one hesitate to affirm that an easy and full explanation is given of the use of the one name or the other in some individual passages; because by the inevitable tendency of language, when words describe the same object, their minor differences or shades of meaning come to be overlooked, and a writer employs the one or the other of them for reasons which may be perfectly satisfactory to him or in themselves, but which are unobserved or not understood by his readers, especially in a later age. It is to be noted that *Bleek*, pp. 239, 240, admits a certain difference in the two names, and a consequent difference in their use, yet in a very limited degree.] The πρῶτον ψεῦδος of the criticism which we are opposing lurks in the identification of El-Shaddai with Elohim, in glaring contradiction to Gen. xvii. 1, where it is not *Elohim*, but *Jehovah*, who reveals Himself to Abraham as El-Shaddai [so that the critics are compelled to assert that the Jehovist has substituted Jehovah for Elohim, though on their principles they can assign no reason for his making this alteration which they imagine him to have made]; in contradiction also to the *usus loquendi* in the whole historical and prophetical books, in which El-Shaddai is everywhere the God of revelation, and identical with Jehovah. Comp. *Oehler* in *Tholuck's* Litt. Anzeiger 1847, No. 77, p. 615 f.

§ 26. *The Marks by which the two Documents in the Pentateuch are said to be distinguishable.*

(1.) *Contradictions and varying Legends.*

Thus the hypothesis of supplements has no firm basis; it also has no marks, such as will bear to be tested, by which to enable us to separate the sections of the fundamental document from the additions and amplifications of the supplementer. For the alleged contradictions, taken as a whole, are only apparent variations in representation, which can be harmonized without difficulty (1).

(1) Contradictions are said to exist "between Gen. i. and ii. 4," etc. [*Bleek*, pp. 240–242, thinks there are plainly two accounts of the creation, the second of which makes no reference to the first; though he admits, so far, that there might be an explanation of the use of the name Jehovah in that second account, since it tells of the giving of a commandment to man. It does not seem to have occurred to him that a most emphatic reference to the first account of creation by *Elohim* is given in the second, when it designates Jehovah (whose name beyond all doubt is appropriately introduced into the narrative of these covenant transactions) *Jehovah-Elohim*, combining the two names in so remarkable a manner. Many things escape the notice of the reader of the English Bible, and of almost all other public translations, owing to the superstitious avoidance of the name Jehovah, a practice which the Jews taught to scholars both in ancient and modern times. *Bleek* proceeds to mention the variations in the second account of creation: the creation of beasts is placed between that of man and that of woman; the growth of plants, etc., is made to depend not simply on God's word, but on rain and human tillage; and man's resemblance to God is represented not as original, but as acquired only after he attained to the knowledge of good and evil.] But these contradictions arise solely from the arbitrary and unfounded assumption that the passage ii. 4, etc., contains a *second* myth about creation, with its materials arranged in the order of time; whereas it simply recapitulates certain creative acts, arranged according to an association of ideas and a connection of pure thought, doing this by way of introduction to the narrative of the fall. Comp. *Kurtz*, Beitrr. i. § 29–53, and 94–108; and *Häv.* Einl. i. 2, p. 107 ff. [*Bleek*, pp. 244–5, thinks that the account of the flood becomes much more simple, by observing that in its present form there are two

histories intermingled, the Elohistic and the Jehovistic; one obvious characteristic of the two different accounts being that the Elohist mentions just one pair of animals, while the Jehovist has introduced the distinction of clean and unclean animals, making seven of the former be preserved. Yet he does not think, as *Eichhorn*, *Hupfeld*, and others have done, that the Jehovist had a second independent history: but he supposes that writer to have made additions to the original document, which is embraced in vi. 9–22, and vii. 6–viii. 19, ix. 1–17, 28, 29; and that he also made certain interpolations at vii. 8, 10, 16. This critical dismemberment and its results may perhaps not seem so "simple" to his readers as it seemed to *Bleek* himself; at any rate, the process has become much more complex in the hands of others of the critical school.]—"Between several verses of ch. x.: vers. 7 and 13 tracing the descent of Havilah, Sheba, Dedan, and Lud to Ham; but vers. 22, 28, 29, and xxv. 3 to Shem" (*Movers*). This conclusion proceeds upon an unjustifiable identification of these names; comp. *Knobel*, Volkertafel, pp. 186 and 262 for Havilah, p. 265 ff. for Sheba and Dedan, and p. 198 ff. and 279 for Lud and Ludim.—"Between Gen. xv. 18, Ex. xxiii. 31, Deut. xi. 24 (comp. Josh. i. 4), which give the Euphrates as the boundary of the land to be inhabited by Israel, and the boundaries designated in Num. xxxiv. 1–12." But the first-mentioned passages are prophetical promises, and, agreeably to their *oratorical* character, they give merely certain great and well-known points as boundaries, which are more precisely defined and limited only when we come to read of the land of the Canaanites, as we always do in these very passages; whereas Num. xxxiv. 1–12 describes the boundaries with *geographical* precision. Comp. *Hengstb.* Beitrr. iii. p. 265, and *Keil* on Josh. i. 4. [Another scheme of reconciliation has proceeded on the principle that these are the widest and narrowest boundaries respectively, the *maxima* and *minima* of the promise, which admitted of a more liberal or a more restricted accomplishment, according as in the sequel Israel should prove fit to occupy the place which lay open for them in the world, or should fail to appreciate their high calling and the warrant to appropriate so vast a territory. In this way might be explained the peculiar expression, 2 Sam. viii. 3, that "David went to *recover his border* at the river Euphrates;" nor would it fit in ill to *Keil's* poetical and prosaic descriptions. Still another explanation is, that the Israelites are in the future to occupy this wide extent of country on occasion of their restoration to their own land; their former occupation, as narrated in the Old Testament, on coming up out of the bondage of Egypt, and much more of course after their return from Babylon, falling far

short of that which was ensured to them by the promise of Jehovah.]—"Between Gen. xxv. 27–33, where Esau sells his birthright to Jacob, and Gen. xxvii. 1–40, where Jacob deceives his brother Esau, so as to obtain his father's blessing meant for the first-born." Now Jacob did use falsehood and deceit to secure his rights, which he perceived to be endangered by Isaac's weak partiality for Esau, ch. xxvii.,—his rights, namely, first by the will of God, and, after xxv. 33, also according to human justice; but there is no contradiction between Jacob's deceit and Esau's earlier sale of his birthright.—"Between Gen. xxvii. 46–xxviii. 9, where Jacob is sent away to Mesopotamia to obtain a wife, and Gen. xxvii. 41–45, according to which he is compelled to fly from Esau's wrath." But the one motive does not exclude the other. Esau's threat to kill his brother can well be thought of in combination with Rebecca's wish that Jacob should take a wife from among her kindred.—"The supplementer in xxx. 24 gives an etymology of the name Joseph different from that of the original document in ver. 23." But "the fundamental document" gives no etymology at all—nothing more than a slight allusion to the name. [Nor is this a solitary case of an allusion to more than one word in giving a name.]—"The narrative of Jacob's manner of acquiring wealth, Gen. xxx. 25–43, differs from that in xxxi. 4–48." But in ch. xxxi. Jacob represents his riches to his wives and to Laban as a divine blessing, and says nothing of the means which he had employed; yet in this there is no contradiction to ch. xxx., where an account is given of these means, [which are in themselves obviously quite insufficient, and which he must have employed under God's guidance].—"Esau's stay in Edom, xxxii. 4, contradicts the Elohistic account, xxxvi. 6 ff., that he first went there after Jacob's arrival." But if xxxiii. 16 belongs to the fundamental document, according to it, also, Esau had moved to Seir before Jacob's return; and the summarized account of Esau's riches and his place of abode, xxxvi. 6–8, says not a word of his *first* moving to Seir after Jacob's return from Mesopotamia and Isaac's death; and finally, in xxxii. 4 ff. (which, moreover, is claimed by *Tuch* as belonging to the fundamental document) nothing is said either of the time or the reason of Esau's removal from Canaan to Seir.—"Gen. xxxii. 22–32 contains an account of Jacob's change of name different from that in the fundamental document at xxxv. 10." But ch. xxxv. is only a solemn confirmation of the name given already on an earlier occasion. "The repeated change of name—a change which at xxxv. 10 does not make any further use of the name, because this use has already been made at xxxii. 29—ought to direct attention to the importance of the holy names; just as the repeated

explanation of Bethel at xxxv. 15 directs attention to the significance of this place" (*Tuch*, p. 481). Comp. also *Welte* on *Herbst's* Einleitung, ii. p. 67. [*Bleek*, pp. 238–9, thinks that there are three well-marked cases of a double history of names, Elohistic and Jehovistic respectively: Bethel, xxviii. 19 and xxxv. 9–15; Beersheba, xxi. 22–34 and xxvi. 17–33; and Israel, xxxii. 29 and xxxv. 10. Of these some further notice will be found in the following note. Also at p. 242 he thinks that these duplicate histories are distinguished, partly at least, by the use of the two divine names, though a note, giving a prelection of his on Genesis, shows that he regards the Elohistic passage xxi. 22–34 as being considerably altered, perhaps ending with ver. 31*a*; and at pp. 243–4 he sees in xx. 18, and perhaps in 17*b*, a similar re-touching by the hand of the later writer. Other critics differ as to the authorship; for instance, *Vaihinger* attributes both xxviii. 19 and xxxv. 9–15 to the Elohist: and of such minor alterations as *Bleek* imagines, it is necessary to say only this, that they evince how entirely arbitrary the whole critical process often is; though we may at times wonder that this Jehovist did not obliterate these awkwardly prominent repetitions and contradictions, when he was making such alterations at any rate as the critics assert.]— "According to Gen. xxvi. 34, Esau took two wives — *Judith* the daughter of Beeri the Hittite, and *Bashemath* the daughter of Elon the Hittite; to whom he added, according to xxviii. 9, *Mahalath* the daughter of Ishmael and sister of Nebaioth. On the contrary, at xxxvi. 2, 3, Esau's three wives are called—*Aholibamah* the daughter of Anah, the daughter (= grand-daughter) of Zibeon the Hivite; *Adah* the daughter of Elon the Hittite, [these being also given in reverse order]; and *Bashemath* the daughter of Ishmael and sister of Nebaioth." But the variation in the three female names in these passages is explained by the very common practice anciently in the East, of changing names and assuming new ones on important occasions, [marriage included]; comp. *Ranke*, Unterss. i. p. 247. In accordance with this custom, *Anah* the son of Zibeon the Hivite obtains the name of *Beeri*, or "man of the well," because he discovered the hot springs in the wilderness; see xxxvi. 24, 25, [where the English version translates "found the mules," adopting a very improbable conjectural rendering]. The other difference, that this Anah or Beeri is called a *Hittite* at xxvi. 34, and a *Hivite* at xxxvi. 2, is explained by the use of Hittite here, as it often is (Josh. i. 4; 1 Kings x. 29; 2 Kings vii. 6), in a wider sense for Canaanite: compare xxvii. 46 with xxviii. 1; comp. *Hengstb.* iii. p. 273 ff. [*Bleek*, p. 238, thinks it is easier to suppose that a writer dependent upon his

various written materials "exerted less self-activity" than would have been necessary in order to make one consistent narrative! *Vaihinger* cannot be supposed to see difficulty in reconciling the accounts, since he makes both of them Elohistic, pp. 341, 343.]—"The account xxxvii. 23–30 is inconsistent with itself, especially ver. 28 with ver. 25; so it is probably elaborated by the Jehovist." But the difference between calling the merchants to whom Joseph was sold *Ishmaelites* in vers. 25, 27, xxxix. 1, and *Midianites* in vers. 28, 36, is explained simply by the indeterminate meaning of *Ishmaelites* = *Arab.* For the rest, comp. *Ranke*, p. 258 f.; *Drechsler*, Einheit u. Echtheit d. Gen. p. 251 ff.; and *Häv.* i. 2, p. 145 f. [The verses 23–36 require, indeed, to be made a very remarkable piece of patchwork, so as to give *Midianites* to the Elohist, Younger Elohist, or Vor-Elohist, and *Ishmaelite* to the Jehovist. Both names, for instance, occur in ver. 28, which is cut up into three or four fragments among two authors or three, according to different critical schemes; and, after all, *Vaihinger* assigns xxxix. 1 to the Elohist, though *Ishmaelites* is the name used there.]—"Between Gen. xxxix. 20 and xl. 4 on the one hand, and xxxix. 21–23 on the other." This alleged contradiction is based upon an arbitrary identification of "the keeper of the prison" in xxxix. 21 with "the captain of the guard" in xl. 4: comp. *Ewald*, Kompos. d. Gen. p. 56; *Ranke*, p. 256; *Kurtz*, Einheit, p. 191 f.; and *Häv.* Einl. p. 147 f.—"We are led to think of two sources by the inconsistency of xlii. 27, 28, xliii. 21, with xlii. 35; and again of xliii. 3–13, xliv. 19–23, with xlii. 9–20, 30–34." But though, according to xliii. 21, the sons of Jacob tell Joseph's steward that they had opened their sacks at the inn, and found every man's money in his sack, whereas according to xlii. 27, 28, 35, only one sack was opened at the inn, and the rest first found their money on opening their sacks at home; and though in the second account of their reception in Egypt by Joseph, who was as yet unknown to them, xliii. 3–13 and xliv. 19–23, Judah passes over the circumstance of his declaration that they were spies (xlii. 9–20, 30–34),—these are circumstances which cannot for a moment be a proof of divergence such as would point to two sources of the history: comp. further, *Ranke*, p. 265 ff.; *Drechsler*, p. 262 ff. [The negative argument from mere silence, as in the latter case, is always of dubious value; and besides, it is not difficult to appreciate the wisdom of Judah's course, if in his deprecatory address he intentionally passed over the charge that they were spies. The former difficulty is also certainly of no importance whatever, as bearing upon the question, Is there evidence of two varying histories? Yet it may be plausibly denied that any difficulty whatever really exists. Accord-

ing to xlii. 35, it was only on *emptying* their sacks at home that the rest found their money; but the one who opened his sack at the inn, ver. 27, found his money in his *sack's mouth*. Nothing would be more natural than for the others to open their sacks too, in their astonishment and anxiety; but not finding the money at the mouth, they might well stop short of emptying their sacks; and the details of this proceeding, which had no bearing upon the general course of the history, are omitted, according to the usual practice, in the sacred narrative. It is really an incidental evidence of the accuracy and truthfulness of the history, that in xliii. 21 the opening of *all* the sacks is mentioned, even if we grant that the speakers made their statement to Joseph's steward so condensed as to fail in strict accuracy throughout; although it is quite possible to defend its strict accuracy, and to leave it exposed to no charge except possibly that of imperfection, by translating, "When we came to the inn we opened our sacks, and, behold, *a* man's money was in his sack, our money in full weight."]—As to the alleged contradictions in ch. xliii.–xlviii., comp. *Häv.* p. 151 ff.

In the three middle books the following contradictions have been found:—"Between Ex. iii. 1, comp. iv. 18 and xviii. 1, where Jethro (יִתְרוֹ or יֶתֶר) is called the חֹתֵן, γαμβρός, or father-in-law of Moses, and ii. 18, 21, where Raguel [Reuel] gives his daughter Zipporah to Moses for a wife." This contradiction might be removed by simply assuming that *Jethro* was a mere title of honour or office belonging to Raguel, [which is the view of *Knobel*, following *Josephus*, Antiq. ii. 12, 1, and *Clericus*], if it were not that Num. x. 29—"And Moses said unto Hobab the son of Raguel the Midianite, Moses' father-in-law"—shows that Moses' father-in-law was properly called Hobab, and received as priest the title of *Jethro*, from יֶתֶר, "pre-eminence," so that in Ex. ii. 18, 21, by "father" and "daughter" are meant "grandfather" and "grand-daughter." [This is a very widely adopted explanation; according to *Knobel*, it is supported by the Targum of Jonathan, by *Aben Ezra* and *Kimchi* among the Rabbins, and by eminent Christian scholars down to *J. D. Michaelis*, *Gesenius*, *Rosenmüller*, and *Winer*.] Against the method of *Ranke*, Unterss. ii. p. 6 ff., and *Baumgarten* on Ex. iii. 1, that Raguel was the father-in-law of Moses, and Hobab his brother-in-law, a comparison of Ex. xviii. and Num. x. 29 is decisive, as they show that Jethro is the same person as Hobab. [More correctly, they give the same title חֹתֵן to both men, if we follow the Masoretic punctuation; otherwise, as in English, we may apply the word "father-in-law" to the nearer antecedent, Raguel. The passage, however, which would still stand in

our way is Judg. iv. 11, where the word is applied to Hobab, without any mention of Raguel. It seems therefore best to take חֹתֵן in these passages, as γαμβρός also may be in Greek, to be "brother-in-law." This view is now adopted by *Keil* himself in his Commentary.]—"Ex. vi. 9 is in striking opposition to iv. 31." The reconciliation, however, is complete, by means of v. 19–23. [*Vaihinger* also says that the Elohist makes his people by no means willing to value the mission of Moses till after they had seen his miracles, whereas the Jehovist ascribes joyful faith to them from the first. It is surely puerile in him to say that v. 19–21 speaks only of the officers, etc., as striving with Moses on account of the increased tasks; for if the officers felt so sore, the common people would be likely to feel very much more sorely. *Vaihinger*, however, p. 355, has an elaborate statement of other differences in the representation given of the exodus by different authors. According to him, the Vor-Elohist makes the people flee secretly out of Egypt, Ex. xiv. 5, though no doubt in battle array, xiii. 18; but the Elohist brings them out openly and boldly, Ex. xiv. 8, Num. xxxiii. 3. The Elohist speaks of the total liberation of Israel, Ex. vi. 11, vii. 2, ix. 35, xi. 10 (*Vaihinger* elsewhere prefers to give ix. 35 to the Vor-Elohist); but the Jehovist speaks merely of the people going to keep a feast to Jehovah at Sinai, which appears to have been an ancient holy place (this last statement having no foundation, and being contradicted by the request to be permitted a journey of *three* days only, as well as by the madness involved in the project of leading a nation to Mount Sinai, unless God was to work constant miracles for them, which Pharaoh at least could not conceive), iii. 18, v. 1, 3, vii. 16, 26, viii. 16, 23, 24, x. 3, 8, 24–26. The Elohist places the staff always in the hand of Aaron as the worker of the miracles, though only in the character of prophet to Moses, Ex. vii. 1, 9, 19, viii. 1, 12; the Jehovist puts it into the hand of Moses, iv. 20*c*, who works the miracles himself, iv. 2, vii. 15, 17, ix. 23, x. 13 (the last two texts alone being to the point; for the first two are earlier than Aaron's appearance on the scene: and the second pair are accounts not of the miracles performed, but of threatenings addressed to Pharaoh, these threatenings being systematically assigned to the Jehovist). Each historian has given five plagues: those of the Elohist being the first, second, third, sixth, and tenth of our present list of ten; though *Vaihinger* gives the eighth (exclusive of the introductory threatening) to the Vor-Elohist. The Elohist represents Israel as going out "with a high hand," xiv. 8, the same expression as in Num. xv. 30, while the Egyptians were in terror and perplexity; the Jehovist represents Pharaoh and his servants as urging them to go

away, which they do so hurriedly that they have not time to bake their dough. And we stand on almost neutral ground at Ex. iii. 20–22, compare xi. 2, 3, xii. 35, 36, which in respect of their contents belong to the Jehovist, but in respect of their language to the Vor-Elohist, —the former endeavouring to harmonize that representation and his own. This singular statement by *Vaihinger* of contradictions involving a plurality of authorship has been given at length, with only one or two interrupting comments in parentheses, because it involves an achievement in criticism of which some recent writers seem to be rather proud. Similar statements may be found, for instance, in *Knobel's* Commentary, though there are always differences of detail as to the contradictions, etc., and as to the alleged authors of different passages. The impartial English reader is not likely to feel very much the force of the reasonings. The great leading result of the criticism—namely, the removal from the fundamental document of five of the plagues, and of the threatenings by which others were preceded—is an astounding discovery, of which certainly neither Jews nor Christians had ever dreamed before; and were it true, it would cut up the beautiful unity of plan according to which these judgments of God proceeded.]—"Between Ex. xiii. 21, 22, and Num. x. 11–28, as the latter tells of the cloud leading the host for the first time;" this "for the first time" being an arbitrary insertion of *De Wette's*.—"Between Ex. ii. 22, iv. 20 ff., and xviii. 2–4." This contradiction is removed by the words "after he had sent her back" in xviii. 2; according to which Moses had sent back his wife and children to his father-in-law during his own struggle with Pharaoh; comp. *Ranke*, ii. p. 37 ff. [*Vaihinger*, p. 364, says Ex. xvii. 8 and xix. 2, both Elohistic, are most closely connected together; and ch. xviii. is plainly an interpolation, since at ver. 5 it makes Jethro come to "the mount of God," which is Mount Sinai (see xxiv. 13), whereas Israel did not come to it till xix. 2. Were there no other reply, it would be sufficient to say that there is no decisive proof of ch. xviii. being meant to precede ch. xix. 2 in respect of time: the meeting with Jethro may have been intentionally narrated first, so as to leave room for an uninterrupted narrative of the meeting with Jehovah at Sinai; compare the history of Joseph in relation to the position of Gen. xxxviii. *Vaihinger* confirms his objection by a reference to the contradictory chronology in Deuteronomy in reference to the appointment of the judges to assist Moses. This subject will be noticed later in § 29, Note 5.]—"According to Lev. xxvii. 27 and Num. xviii. 16, the first-born of unclean animals were to be redeemed with money; on the contrary, according to Ex. xiii. 13 and xxxiv. 20, they were to be redeemed with a sheep,

or otherwise to be put to death." This difference is to be explained by a later modification of the original law, for the advantage of the income of the priests; comp. *Winer*, bibl. Real-Wörterbuch, i. p. 342, note. [It scarcely deserves to be called a modification; and Num. xviii. 15, 16 is so general as to need no reconciliation.]—"According to Ex. xx. 1–6 and Deut. xv. 12–18, a Hebrew slave was to go free in the seventh year of his servitude; according to Lev. xxv. 39 ff., on the contrary, in the year of jubilee." There is no contradiction: his freedom came in the seventh year; yet it came even earlier, if the jubilee occurred: comp. *Michaelis*, Mos. Recht. § 127; *Hengstb.* Beitrr. iii. p. 440. When *Stähelin*, Unterss. p. 20, claims as necessary the mention of this rule of the seventh year in Lev. xxv. 47–55, he relies upon the erroneous assumption that a stranger, to whom a Hebrew had sold himself as a servant, was bound to release him in the seventh year without a *ransom*.—"Between Lev. xxiii. and Num. xxviii. xxix., which mention five great feasts and holy convocations, and Ex. xxiii. 14–16, xxxiv. 18–23, and Deut. xvi. 1–7 [1–17?], where only three feasts are mentioned, along with pilgrimages to the sanctuary." But here there is no contradiction, unless we wrongly identify the holy convocation with the pilgrimage to the sanctuary. Lev. xxiii. gives the list of the whole feast-seasons, מוֹעֲדֵי יְהוָה [Jehovah's times of appointed meeting; in Scotch, His trysts], on which occasions holy convocations, מִקְרָאֵי קֹדֶשׁ, occurred, and all business ceased; but this class included not only the three great feasts, but all the appointed times of meeting, with the Sabbath at their head. Hence it plainly follows, not only that "a holy convocation" neither required nor meant a pilgrimage to the sanctuary, but also that this passage is not intended to give a comprehensive and exhaustive law in regard to the feasts. Again, Num. xxviii. and xxix. contain a list of all the offerings to be brought on all the days of the year (not on feast-days alone), without determining anything as to the number of the great feasts. Also Ex. xxiii. and xxxiv. and Deut. xvi. give us no complete calendar of feast-days; but in connection with the ordinances as to hallowing the first-born (comp. Ex. xxiii. 19, xxxiv. 19, 20, Deut. xv. 19–23), they treat only *incidentally* and *briefly* of those feasts at which Israel was to appear annually before their God, at His sanctuary, with offerings of the first-fruits of the land which Jehovah had bestowed upon them, and there enjoy communion with Him. This special object of these last-named passages explains also that designation of the month in which the passover was celebrated *as the month of ears of corn* [Eng. ver. "Abib"], Ex. xxiii. 15, xxxiv. 18, Deut. xvi. 1, because the first-fruits

of the ripe ears were to be presented at the passover; whereas in Lev. xxiii. and Num. xxviii. xxix., giving a list of all the holy times, and of the entire body of offerings for the whole year, the individual months are necessarily designated first, second, etc., in their numerical order; for this reason, that the ancient Hebrews at that time had no special name for any of the months except the first. Even in Ex. xiii. 4, "the month of ears" stands in connection with first-fruits and first-born. Finally, that *only* the seventh or last day of the great annual feasts is to be celebrated as a Sabbath, according to Ex. xiii. and Deut. xvi., is a statement not to be found in these texts. Ex. xiii. 6 runs, "Six days shalt thou eat unleavened bread, and on the seventh day shall be a feast to Jehovah;" while in ver. 3 the feast on the first day is assumed to be already known from xii. 15, 16. And in Deut. xvi. 8 the seventh day is called עֲצֶרֶת לַיהוָה, on which no business might be done [Eng. version, "a solemn assembly," in the margin "a day of restraint;" *Keil* himself in his Commentary explains it, the "closing" day of a series].—For other contradictions which *Hitzig* has discovered in the laws relating to the passover, comp. *Hengstb.* p. 359 ff.; and *Bertheau*, die sieben Gruppen mos. Gesetze, Göttingen 1840, p. 49 ff.—"Between Lev. xxiii. 18, 19, where seven lambs, one bullock, and two rams are appointed as a burnt-offering, and one he-goat for a sin-offering, and two lambs for a peace-offering at the feast of weeks, and Num. xxviii. 27, 30, where it is two bullocks, one ram, seven lambs for the burnt-offering, and one goat for the sin-offering." But Leviticus treats of the sacrifices connected with the presentation of the loaves of the first-fruits; and Numbers, again, treats of the general offerings belonging to that feast-day. Comp. *Keil*, Handbuch d. bibl. Archæol. 1858, i. p. 397 f. [Observe, in confirmation of this, an expression recurring so often, "*besides* the continual burnt-offering," etc., xxviii. 10, etc.]

"Between Num. i. and Ex. xxxviii. 25, 26, compared with xxx. 12 ff." But Exodus assumes a simple numbering of the people for a poll-tax; whereas the object of the thoroughly arranged census in Numbers is not merely to number the people, but to make an orderly disposition of the men of war both in the camp and on the march, as the Lord's host: in which proceeding the chief business was not the numbering, but the registering of the men fit to bear arms, and the arrangement of all the individual divisions of the host according to their twelve tribes. Comp. *J. D. Michaelis*, de censibus Hebr., in the Commentatt. Gött., Bremen 1763, p. 14; *Ranke*, p. 129 f.; and *Häv.* i. 2, p. 422 ff. Another explanation is given by *Kurtz*, Geschichte des Alten Bundes, ii. p. 335.—"Between Num. iv. 6

and Ex. xxv. 15." The apparent contradiction is this, that in Numbers the staves are first put into the ark after it has been wrapped up; whereas in Exodus it is said they are never to be taken out of the rings: it is explained by comparing Ex. xxxvii. 5, where Bezaleel puts the bars into the rings when the ark is made, with Ex. xl. 20, where at the setting up of the tabernacle Moses (again) puts the staves into the ark. Thus we arrive at the plain sense of Num. iv. 6, that when the tabernacle was broken up and the ark packed for carrying, the staves were pulled out of the rings that the ark might be wrapped up, and so must again be pushed into their place.—"Between Num. iv. 3, 23, 30, 35, 47, according to which the Levites do duty at the tabernacle from the age of thirty to that of fifty, and Num. viii. 24, 25, according to which they go into its service from twenty-five to fifty years of age." This is no contradiction; since ch. iv. gives the ordinances as to bearing and transporting the tabernacle during the wandering in the wilderness, whereas ch. viii. refers to the service at worship. For the עֲבֹדָה enjoined on the Levites in ch. iv. began בְּנֹסַע הַמַּחֲנֶה (ver. 5), and consisted simply in bearing certain parts of the tabernacle (vers. 15, 19, 25, 27, 31, 32, 47, 49); whereas in ch. viii. they were to do אֶת־עֲבֹדַת יְהוָה (ver. 11) "before Aaron and before his sons" (ver. 22); that is, they were to attend upon the priests as they performed divine service. So *Hengstb.* p. 392 ff., rightly following *Aben Ezra, Lightfoot, Reland, Outram.* There is nothing in the objections of *Bähr*, Symbolik, ii. p. 41, and *Winer*, bibl. Real-Wörterbuch, ii. p. 21.—"Between Num. x. 12 and xii. 16." But x. 12 gives at once the remoter limit of the next encampment of the children of Israel, the results of which were so influential in reference to the wandering of the children of Israel; and in xii. 16 this is precisely determined by means of the last station, only after the events have been recorded which had taken place at several intermediate stations.—"According to Num. xi. 16, compared with vers. 24–26 and xii. 4, the tabernacle stood outside the camp, in contradiction to the rules for encamping in ch. ii. iii." But it does not by any means follow from the first-named passages that the tabernacle stood "outside the camp," as is clearly seen by comparing them with xii. 14, 15, and especially with Ex. xxxiii. 7. The expression, "And Moses went out," Num. xi. 24, is therefore to be explained by this, that the tabernacle stood in the middle of the camp, on a spot where it was separate from everything else; so that in coming before it, it was necessary to leave the camping-ground of the individual tribes, and go out to it. Again, Ex. xxxiii. 7 does not speak of the sacred tabernacle, but only of the tent which Moses set up outside the camp before the erection of

the tabernacle, and which also received the name of the "tabernacle of meeting" [Eng. ver. "of the congregation." This is a matter to which *Vaihinger* also assigns considerable importance, alleging, p. 355, that it is characteristic of the Vor-Elohist to place the tabernacle outside the camp. More particularly, at p. 365 he names another peculiarity in the representations of this writer, that the tabernacle is composed not of materials brought by the free-will offerings of the people, as in xxxvi. 4–6, but of their ornaments which they have stripped off, and to which some stain of idolatry was supposed to cleave, comparing Gen. xxxv. 4: this is surely a fancy for which he can find no support in Ex. xxxiii. 4–6. But, reiterating the objection from the next verse, he rejects the various explanations that have been offered: he says it could not be a *political* tabernacle, but it was for a religious purpose (see xxxiv. 34, 35); nor a *preliminary* tabernacle, as *Keil* and many others suppose, for of this there is no hint in the history, nor was it necessary, inasmuch as the tabernacle was erected within ten months of the arrival of Israel at Sinai; nor yet the *family tent of Moses*, which is contradicted by xxxiii. 8 ff., that Moses went out to it to meet Jehovah, and then returned to the people in the camp, and dwelt with them. It is by no means clear that he has offered any decisive objection to either of these last two explanations; and in a confessedly obscure matter, one might accept either of them. Yet there seems to be a simpler solution; for the difficulty entirely disappears, if only we give attention to the ordinary force of the *Vav of consecution*, and render the verbs with the proper tense. "And Jehovah said unto Moses, 'Say unto the children of Israel, Ye are a stiff-necked people; I will come up into the midst of thee in a moment, and consume thee: and now put off thy ornaments, that I may know what to do unto thee.' (And so the children of Israel stripped themselves of their ornaments by the mount Horeb.) 'And Moses shall take the tabernacle, and pitch it outside the camp, afar off from the camp, and call it The tabernacle of meeting. And it shall come to pass, that every one who seeketh Jehovah shall go out unto the tabernacle of meeting, which shall be outside the camp. And it shall come to pass, when Moses shall go out unto the tabernacle, that all the people shall rise up, and stand,'" etc. In this case, we should understand the whole speech of Jehovah to Moses to involve a threat; but the people having obeyed the directions with which the speech opened, and thus having humbled themselves, as ver. 6 relates, and Moses having interceded for them, their repentance was accepted, and their humiliation was not further pressed by carrying out the rest of the directions]. Also the information, Num. x. 33, that the ark went

before the host, is not in contradiction to the arrangements for encamping, but is merely supplementary to them. It tells that, as they set out, and in their marches, the ark was separated from the other holy things, and was carried in front of the whole host; and that thus, even during the march, this sanctuary to which God had attached His presence, continued in the immediate vicinity of that pillar of cloud which shadowed forth the presence of God, and which ever led the way; and that, in accordance with Num. ix. 15–23, this permanent connection remained unbroken. Comp. *Baumgarten* on Num. x. 33.—"In Num. xiii. 16 Hoshea first receives the name of Joshua, which nevertheless he has already borne, Ex. xvii. 9, xxiv. 13, and Num. xi. 28" [also Ex. xxxii. 17, xxxiii. 11; all the five texts being given by *Vaihinger*, p. 364, to the Vor-Elohist]. This is explained by a prolepsis such as is often exemplified. The change of Hoshea's name into Jehoshua by Moses in Num. xiii., when he was about to set foot on the soil of Canaan along with the other spies, making it refer to *the help of Jehovah*, recalls the memory of that significant victory which Joshua had gained over Amalek, Ex. xvii. 8–16, and gives the certain pledge of a happy issue to that contact with the land and people of Canaan which was now to begin; comp. *Baumgarten*, p. 308. Others take it differently [supposing the time of the change mentioned in Num. xiii. to have really been when he conquered Amalek, a matter of no great importance, as to which we cannot be certain]; see *Hengstb.* pp. 395–6.—"According to Num. xiv. 45, the Amalekites and the Canaanites on the southern boundary-line of Palestine drove the Israelites back to Hormah; on the contrary, according to Num. xxi. 3, the Israelites smote the king of Arad and the Canaanites, and named the place Hormah." But the former event occurred in the *second* year of the exodus, and the latter in the *fortieth;* and it is by an intentional and significant prolepsis that the place already bears the name of Hormah in ch. xiv. 45: comp. *Hengstb.* p. 220 ff., and *Keil* on Josh. xii. 14. [*J. H. Arnold* notices, in Num. xxi. 3 it is said, "he called the name of the *place* Hormah;" whereas in Judg. i. 17—a passage which has caused needless allegations of contradiction—"the name of the *city*" Zephath, which was utterly destroyed by the people after their settlement in Canaan, was called Hormah. He suggests that on the earlier occasion the cities may have been devoted to destruction,—a sense which the word will perfectly well bear.]—"Num. xxi. 13 ff. is not in harmony with xxxiii. 45 ff." In reply to this, comp. *Ranke*, p. 247 ff.; and in reference to the whole table of stations in Num. xxxiii., comp. *Hengstb.* p. 427 ff., and *Kurtz*, p. 361 ff., 400 ff.—"Num. xxxi. 8, 16, gives quite a different view of

Balaam from ch. xxiv. 25." This assertion rests on an incorrect identification of וַיֵּשֶׁב לִמְקוֹמוֹ in xxiv. 25 with וַיֵּשֶׁב אֶל־מְקוֹמוֹ. It ought to be translated, "And Balaam rose up, and went and turned back *towards* his place;" that is, he set out to return, as Balak also went his way,—without, however, saying that he actually completed his journey homewards. [*Blunt*, in his Coincidences, suggests that Balaam had been hired by two parties, the king of Moab and the elders of Midian; that now, when he had finished his dealings with Balak, he would naturally go to the Midianites, to whom he gave the vile advice which proved successful against Israel in the first instance, though at last it recoiled on him who gave it, and on his friends.]

Also in the Pentateuch there are no different legends as to one and the same occurrence; nor are there any other traces of different occurrences having been confounded (2).

(2) In the following instances, support has been expected for the assertion that there is a difference in the legends, and two sets of accounts of one and the same event:—"Gen. xvii., the covenant of God with Abraham; also in ch. xv., yet wanting the institution of circumcision and the promise of Isaac, which are related in ch. xviii." But ch. xv. informs us that the covenant was concluded; and ch. xvii. that it began to be carried into execution, and that the promise in ch. xv. was more precisely determined: for in xv. 4, one who should come out of Abraham's loins was to be his heir, and in xvii. 15 ff. it was explained that this heir was to be born to him by Sarah. Comp. *Häv.* i. 2, p. 87 ff., and p. 124 ff.—"The taking away of Sarah at Gerar, ch. xx., resembles the occurrence in Egypt, ch. xii. 10–19, and that with Rebecca in Gerar, ch. xxvi. 1–11." But one cannot see why in those rude ages this should not occur repeatedly in different places, and at considerable intervals of time; particularly as the points of resemblance in these narratives are exceeded by more important points of difference, and as each carries with it all the marks of historical truth in certain circumstances which are peculiar to it. Comp. *Drechsler*, p. 223; *Ranke*, i. p. 208 ff.; and *Häv.* i. 2, p. 250 f. [*Vaihinger* indeed attributes both the narratives in Abraham's history to one writer, the Vor-Elohist.]—"In Gen. xxi. 9–21 and xvi. 4–16, we have the same legend about Hagar and Ishmael in two different shapes." But the resemblance in the two narratives relates to accessory matters, the recurrence of which amid the simple relations of nomadic life cannot surprise any one; whereas in all the points of essential moment a total dissimilarity prevails. Comp. *Kurtz*,

Einheit, p. 106 f.—The same is true of the resemblance of the covenants with Abimelech made by Abraham and Isaac respectively, in ch. xxi. 22–34 and xxvi. 26–33. Besides, the well which Isaac named *Shibah*, xxvi. 33, is scarcely to be identified with Abraham's, xxi. 30, since there are still *two* great wells to be found at Beersheba. Comp. *Drechsler*, p. 228; and *Baumgarten*, i. p. 255 f.—"The repeated consecration of Bethel, Gen. xxviii. 18, 19, and xxxv. 14, 15," is a fact resting on a sure foundation, the renewed divine revelation which Jacob here enjoyed; and the naming of the place in ch. xxxv. is only a renewal of the name which had been given earlier. [Accordingly both passages are assigned to the Elohist by *Vaihinger*. See, in the preceding note, p. 107, some inserted matter in regard to him and *Bleek* upon this and the preceding point. The repeated naming of Bethel need the less surprise us, as this seems to have been the significant and deeply interesting name of the place which Jacob used, and taught his descendants to use; whereas Luz continued to be the name in use among the Canaanites until the conquest, Judg. i. 23. The two revelations to Jacob, in connection with his own change of name, were indeed so intimately connected, that they may be called the same essentially; but no critic, whatever may be his boldness or his scepticism, does well to infer that there is an erroneous repetition of the same occurrence: for the one was made to Jacob in secret as he fled all alone, and the other was made to him for public use as he returned with his family to worship God, who had appeared to him, and to whom he had made his vow. A striking parallel in Christian experience occurs in justification with the secret testimony of the Spirit in a man's heart at present, and the open acknowledgment and acquittal which awaits him at the day of judgment.]—"Ex. xii. 1–28 and 43–51 inform us of the institution of the passover, and xiii. 1, 2 of the consecration of the first-born; close beside them, at xiii. 2–16, there is another law on both subjects." This is erroneous. Ch. xii. 1–28 contains the fundamental law as to the aim, the meaning, and the manner of the paschal offering, and the seven days of eating unleavened bread; vers. 43–51 state the regulation as to those who should partake of it, and the law in xiii. 1, 2 prescribes the consecration of the first-born; finally, all these laws, which God had given to Moses, are communicated by Moses to the people in xiii. 3–16.—"Ex. xvi. relates to the gift of manna and of quails; Num. xi. resembles it in the gift of quails." But is it then at all improbable that, in the arid wilderness, Israel should immediately murmur for want of animal food, Ex. xvi., and once again at a later time should long for it with passionate vehemence when they came to loathe the manna?

Quails were twice sent by God: of which circumstance the easy explanation is, that this way of satisfying them was particularly natural in that locality, since vast hosts of these birds are found in Arabia Petræa. [And if the two occurrences were about the passover season in two successive years, there is additional historical verisimilitude, owing to the fact that the quails are birds of passage, making their annual migrations across that country at that season in countless numbers.] In other respects the two narratives are very dissimilar. In Exodus the feeding with quails is quite subordinate to the gift of the manna: in Numbers it is the principal matter; and they are given, not for a day, but for a whole month, till the people loathe them. Finally, the conduct of God and of Moses is totally different in the two cases. Comp. *Ranke*, p. 175 ff.; *Baumgarten*, p. 296 ff.—There is equally little to surprise us in the Israelites rebelling twice for want of water in the course of their forty years' stay in the wilderness, Ex. xvii. 1 ff. and Num. xx. 1 ff., and both times obtaining water from the rock; while all the other circumstances in the two cases are different. The first murmuring took place at Rephidim, which place in consequence obtained the name of Massah and Meribah (Ex. xvii. 1 and 7); the second in the wilderness of Zin, at Kadesh (Num. xx. 1): the first time Moses brings the water by striking the *rock*, צוּר, in Horeb (ver. 6); the second time he does so with the staff which lay before Jehovah (vers. 8, 9), out of the *stone* [cliff?], סֶלַע (vers. 10, 11); and on this latter occasion Moses and Aaron fell into sin, of which we read nothing in Exodus. Comp. *Ranke*, p. 227 ff.; *Hengstb.* p. 378 ff.—As to the pretended repetition in Num. xiv. 11–25 and 26–38, comp. *Ranke*, p. 192 ff.—Finally, in Num. xvi. there is said to be a mixing up of two different events: the fundamental document giving the narrative only of Korah and his band of 250 men, mostly Levites; the supplementer, again, mixing up with it the sedition of the Reubenites Dathan and Abiram, directed more against the civil authority of Moses. Thus vers. 2, 4–11, 16–23, 35, are elements in the former narrative; vers. 12–15, 25–34, are additions of the supplementer; but vers. 12, 14, 27, 32, are interpolated (*Stähelin*, p. 33 ff.). But this hypothesis, which needs to have recourse to so many interpolations, is already refuted by ver. 3, which *Stähelin* passes over in entire silence. For this verse (with which the fundamental document cannot dispense, as it is the means of transition from ver. 2 to ver. 4) assumes that people of celebrity in the other tribes had taken part in the rebellion of Korah, since they say to Moses, "*all* the congregation are holy." And so, too, xvii. 16–28 and xviii. 4, 5, 22, which are purely elements of the so-called fundamental document, assume that

other tribes took part in the revolt, and justify the statement, xvi. 1, 2, that besides the Levite Korah, also the Reubenites Dathan, Abiram, and On were at the head of the insurrection; as is also repeated at xxvi. 9, 10. Besides, the reasons for violently tearing the context asunder are scarcely worth mentioning. For Korah's being at the tabernacle with incense, ver. 19, does not conflict with ver. 27, where he appears beside his own dwelling [in fact, this is *not* said at ver. 27, though it may perhaps be inferred from a comparison with xxvi. 10], unless the words "at the same time" be smuggled into the text, as they are by *Stähelin*. And that the earth swallowed him up (vers. 31–33), like Dathan and Abiram (ver. 12), does not contradict vers. 35, 39, 40 [in the Hebrew, xvi. 35, xvii. 4, 5]; since according to vers. 35, 39, only the 250 adherents of the ringleaders were consumed by the fire, and in ver. 40 the way and manner of the destruction is left undetermined. There is just as little of contradiction between xvi. 35 and xxvi. 11, as there is not a syllable in ch. xvi. about Korah's sons taking part in their father's rebellion.

§ 27.—(2.) *Difference in the Circle of Ideas, and in the usus loquendi.*

We must bear in mind that the shares in the book of Genesis allotted to the fundamental document and to the supplementer respectively have been distinguished and assigned chiefly with reference to the two divine names Elohim and Jehovah; and also that these names express different sides of the Israelite consciousness of God. Further, we must bear in mind that the matter in the three middle books has been assigned to these two imaginary authors in such a way that, with very slight exceptions, the legislative elements belong to the fundamental document, and the historical narratives mostly (in particular, all the miraculous events) to the supplementer. It is therefore inconceivable that *all* the views, representations, and conceptions can come before us in both divisions (1). In Genesis, the Jehovistic sections will contain many representations which are wanting in the Elohistic (2); and no less in the intermediate books, the legislative sections will present not a few peculiar conceptions with which we do not meet in the historical portions (3).

(1) *Kurtz*, Einheit d. Gen. p. liii.: "If it is firmly established that a difference exists between the conceptions involved in the two divine names; and further, if it is indisputable that the selection of

the divine names is not arbitrary, but induced and determined by the contents of the passage; then the inference is self-evident, that the Elohistic and the Jehovistic portions must each contain and present ideas of their own." [This seems the meaning intended; but the original is very peculiar: "dass die elohistischen Stücke auch jehovistischen Inhalt darbieten müssen."]

(2) In particular, the so-called Levitical views in Genesis. Such are the appearances of Jehovah in visible form, iii. 8 ff., xviii. 1 ff.; and of the Angel of Jehovah, who passes over into Jehovah Himself, xvi. 7 ff., xxii. 11, 15, Ex. iii. 2; offerings brought to Jehovah, iv. 3 f., viii. 20, xv. 9 f.; altars built to Him, xii. 7, 8, xiii. 8 [4?], xxvi. 25; worship of His name, קָרָא בְּשֵׁם יְהוָה, iv. 26, xii. 8, xiii. 4, xxi. 33, xxvi. 25; distinction of clean and unclean animals, vii. 2, 8, viii. 20; the prophetic element in primitive and early times, v. 29, ix. 25 ff., xv. 13–16, and xii. 3, xviii. 18, xxvi. 4, xxviii. 14.

(3) For instance, the frequent use of לְדֹרֹתָיכֶם and ־ם ["in their, your, generations"], especially in connection with ["a statute for ever"] חֹק or חֻקַּת followed by עוֹלָם, Ex. xii. 14, 17, xxvii. 21, xxviii. 43, xxx. 21, Lev. iii. 17, vi. 11, vii. 36, xvii. 7, xxiii. 14, 21, 41, xxiv. 3, Num. x. 8, xv. 15, xviii. 23; or with בְּרִית עוֹלָם ["an everlasting covenant"], Gen. xvii. 7, 9, 12, Ex. xxxi. 16, Lev. xxxi. [?] 13, 16. This occurs only with *laws* as to circumcision, the Sabbath, the passover, and other feasts, offerings, purifications from sin, etc., which constitute the essential peculiarity of the theocratic people. It is the same with the formula of threatening upon transgressions of fundamental laws of the theocracy, וְנִכְרְתָה הַנֶּפֶשׁ הַהִוא ["that soul shall be cut off"], Ex. xii. 15, 19 (xxx. 33, 38), xxxi. 14, Lev. vii. 20, 21, 25, 27, xix. 8, xxii. 3, xxiii. 29, Num. ix. 13, xv. 8 [30?], xix. 13, 20 (comp. *Kurtz*, p. 93). Also the expressions אֶזְרָח and גֵּר ["a stranger and one born in the land"], only in laws, Ex. xii. 19, 48, 49, Lev. xvi. 29, xvii. 15, xviii. 26, xxiv. 16, 22, Num. ix. 14, xv. 29, 30 (which cannot be expected in the supplementer, because none of the legislative sections are left to him except "the rights of the covenant of Israel," for which it was sufficient to lay down the general principle, Ex. xxii. 21 [Heb. ver. 20], "Thou shalt neither vex a stranger nor oppress him, for ye were strangers in the land of Egypt," reiterated xxiii. 9): בֵּית אָבוֹת ["fathers' houses"] and רָאשֵׁי אָבוֹת ["heads of fathers"], occurring only in genealogical settlements, Ex. vi. 14, Num. i.–iv., vii. 2, xvii. 7 ff., xxv., and xxvi., which, without exception, are claimed for the fundamental document: הִקְרִיב, "to offer," and its noun קָרְבָּן, which are found only in the laws as to offerings in Lev. and Num.: עָמִית, "next, neighbour," occurring only in

the laws as to injury done to a neighbour [Lev. v. 21, xviii. 20, xix. 11, 15, 17, xxiv. 19, xxv. 14, 15, 17]: שַׁבָּתוֹן, only in the laws for feast-days, Ex. xvi. 23, xxxi. 15, xxxv. 2, Lev. xvi. 31, xxiii. 3, xxv. 4, 5, xxxi. [xxiii.?] 24, 32, 39; of these laws only one is left to the supplementer, the general appointment of the Sabbath, Ex. xx. 9–11, in which this word was unsuitable: שְׁגָגָה, of unintentional sins, Lev. iv. 2, 22, etc.; about these the supplementer has no laws: מִגְרָשִׁים, the pasture-ground about the Levitical cities, treated of only in Lev. xxv. 34 and Num. xxxv. 2, 4, 5.

This alleged fact of a diversity in the language and ideas in the Pentateuch has been shown to rest upon a very insecure foundation (§ 25); and, moreover, they arrive at it (4) to a very large extent only by an artificial separation, aided by the assumption of many interpolations and re-touchings of the fundamental document on the part of the supplementer (5). If it were to be a criterion of diversity of authorship, it could become a valid proof of the hypothesis of supplements only in one of two ways: either generally, if the fundamental document made a representation of primeval history and of patriarchal life which differed from the picture of these times and these relations in the supplementary sections; or, in particular, if the peculiar ideas in the supposed different authors contradicted one another. Neither of these propositions has hitherto been proved to be true. The Elohist (the author of the fundamental document) does not give a simpler and less artificial representation of the religious aspects of antiquity, its manners, and its arrangements of life, than the Jehovist (supplementer) (6); and in depicting them, he does not present ideas which would contradict the circle of ideas in which the supplementer moves (7).

(4) Compare *Kurtz*, Einheit d. Gen. p. xxxiv. ff., for the manner in which criticism moves in fallacies, begging the question and reasoning in a circle.

(5) For instance, interpolations are said to be found in Gen. v. 29, vii. 16, xvii. 1, xix. 29, xx. 18, xxi. 1 (17), 33, 34, xxii. 11, xxv. 2–4, xxviii. 21, xxix. 31–35, xxxi. 49, xxxv. 1–7, xlix. 18. And passages said to be re-touched are: Gen. x., xxv. 2–4, 21–34, xxxv. 1–7, xxxvii. (the whole of it), xxxix.–xlvi. 23 (?), Ex. xii. 39, Lev. xx., Num. xvi. 1, 24, etc.

(6) According to *Tuch*, p. lxi. ff.; *Stähelin*, p. 64 ff.; *De Wette*, p.

180 ff.; *Knobel*, p. xvi. f.; *Hupfeld*, pp. 93 ff. and 212 f., the Elohist has as much as possible represented antiquity as being simple and inartificial: whereas the supplementer has almost entirely abolished the distinction between earlier and later times; not only throwing back the worship of Jehovah and its institutions into primeval times, but also tracing back the origin of arts and handicrafts to the first generations of the human race, and partly endowing the patriarchs with all sorts of articles of luxury, partly representing them as far more magnificent than they appear in the fundamental document. Yet this document contains plenty of matter preparatory to the Mosaic laws and Levitical institutions: as, for instance, the hallowing of the Sabbath to be a day of rest, Gen. ii. 3, compared with Ex. xx. 11; the prohibition of blood for food, Gen. ix. 4, compared with Lev. xvii. 10 ff.; circumcision as the sign of the covenant, Gen. xvii.; Levitical purifications, Gen. xxxv. 2, 3, precisely as Ex. xix. 10; altars, Gen. [xxii. 9,] xxxi. 1, 7, xxxiii. 20, xxxv. 1, 7; burnt-offerings, sacrifices, and drink-offerings, Gen. xxii. 13, xxxv. 14, xlvi. 1; vows and tithes, Gen. xxviii. 20 and 22; the Angel of God and appearances of angels, Gen. xxi. 17 ff., xxviii. 12; prophetic predictions and glances into the future, Gen. ix. 11, xvii. 3–8, 16, 19 ff., xxi. 18. Neither is antiquity represented as simple and inartificial in the fundamental document more than by the supplementer. In the former writer, the building of the ark, Gen. vi. 14 ff., presupposes acquaintance with all those trades and that skill in the arts, the discovery of which originated with the first generations of the human race, according to the latter writer. And according to the former as well as the latter, the patriarchs possessed great riches in silver (Gen. xxxii. 9 ff., compared with xx. 16 and xvii. 23, 27), and articles of luxury, like ear-rings, xxxv. 4; and they appear in no respect simpler, or less opulent, respected, and powerful. And finally, we may see from one circumstance how little the supplementer aims at glorifying the patriarchs or Moses, and the people of Israel; namely this, that it is he who principally narrates the weaknesses and sins of these men, and almost all the revolts of the people of Israel against God and the men whom He sent: comp. Gen. iii. 6, 9 ff., ix. 21 ff., xii. 12 ff., xxvi. 7 ff., xxvii. 1–36, xxx. 25–42, xxxviii. (see *Kurtz*, p. lvi. f.), Num. xxvii. 13, 14, Ex. xvii. 2, 3, Num. xi. and xii., xiv. 1–4.

(7) Most of the ideas which are adduced as peculiar to the fundamental document, or characteristic of the Elohist, occur also in the supplementer, or at least agree with his ideas. Thus, "that of the longevity of the patriarchs, Gen. v. and xi. 10 ff." (*Tuch*, p. lx.); quite in harmony with the supplementer's account of Noah's age,

Gen. vii. 6.—"The patriarchs consecrate Bactylia [pillars] to God, according to a less pure (?) ritual, Gen. xxviii. 18 f., xxxv. 14 f." (*Tuch*): only in consequence of theophanies, so that this rite cannot have been impure or in conflict with the views of the religion of Jehovah.—"It cannot be accidental that the invariable language of the fundamental document in relation to covenants of God with man is נָתַן or הֵקִים, until it can use כָּרַת, Ex. xxiv. 8,—a sacrificial expression, when once Jehovah has revealed Himself as the God of sacrifice." It is by no means accidental, but just as little is it an idiosyncrasy of the Elohist, whilst instead of these expressions, the Jehovist uses כָּרַת, as *Stähelin* and *Delitzsch*, Gen. ii. p. 177, believe; for the expressions have different significations. הֵקִים, "spoken of a covenant," is to cause it to stand, that is, to realize the promises which are made sure in it; and so נָתַן (Gen. ix. 12, xvii. 2; Num. xxv. 12), to *give* a covenant, that is to say, to give what is promised in it, or to fulfil it. כָּרַת, on the contrary, is only *to conclude* a covenant, when the parties bind themselves by a solemn act to mutual services. According to this distinction, the fundamental document never could apply כָּרַת in Gen. vi. 18, ix. 9, 11, 17, xvii. 2 ff., Ex. vi. 4; because Gen. vi. and ix. speak only of *setting up* a covenant, that is, of establishing the promises given to Noah; and Gen. xvii. 2 and Ex. vi. 4 speak of the realization of the covenant concluded with Abraham in Gen. xv. But where its expression is demanded by the course of thought, כָּרַת also is used in the fundamental document, Gen. xxi. 27, 32, xxxi. 44, of *concluding* a covenant; as in like manner the supplementer applies הֵקִים to the realization of the covenant which has been concluded, Lev. xxvi. 9, Deut. viii. 18. Consequently these are not "favourite expressions exclusively" of the one and the other writer respectively.—"Tokens of a covenant given by God, Gen. ix. 12, 13, xvii. 11," are analogous to confirmatory tokens given by God, according to the supplementer, Gen. iv. 15, xxiv. 12 ff., Ex. iii. 12, iv. 1 ff. (comp. *Kurtz*, p. 82 f.).—"Jacob is called Israel." An erroneous assertion: for the fundamental document, Gen. xxxv. 10 [9 ?]–l., uses the name Jacob forty times, and Israel thirty-four times; the supplementer uses Jacob four times, and Israel once; or if we assign ch. xlii. to the former, as *Tuch* does, then the supplementer uses only Israel, and never Jacob. Comp. *Kurtz*, p. 194.—"The geographical description, 'in the plains of Moab, by Jordan, near Jericho,' Num. xxvi. 3, 63, xxxi. 12, xxxiii. 48, etc.," occurs in the supplementer, Num. xxii. 1.—"The glory of Jehovah appearing in a cloud, Ex. xvi. 10, xl. 34, Lev. ix. 23," is quite in harmony with the supplementer's accounts, Ex. xix. 9, 16–18, xxxiv. 5, Num. xi. 25, compared with

Num. xiv. 22; only he has sometimes used, instead of "cloud," also "pillar of cloud" (Num. xii. 5, compared with vers. 9, 10, and xiv. 14), particularly in the connected expression "pillar of cloud and of fire," to designate the symbol of the visible presence of Jehovah which guided Israel as they marched through the wilderness (Ex. xiii. 21 f., xiv. 19, xxxiii. 9 f.; Deut. xxxi. 15); instead of which, "cloud and fire," or "and the appearance of fire" (מַרְאֵה אֵשׁ), occurs in the passages left to the fundamental document, Ex. xl. 34, 38, and Num. ix. 15–23.—"The meeting of Jehovah with Moses in the tabernacle, Ex. xxv. 22, xxix. 42, 43, xxx. 6, 36, and Num. xvii. 19" (*De Wette*); with which the supplementer also is acquainted, Num. xi. 17, xiv. 10 ff., although he is said to have no share in the sketch given of the tabernacle, Ex. xxv.–xxxi.

In the same way, the ideas which are said to be peculiar to the *supplementer* are partly found in the fundamental document too, or are wanting only because in the portions assigned to it no occasion is presented for mentioning them; partly they are not constant enough, or are much too seldom used to be of any value as distinguishing characteristics. Besides those ideas which are closely connected with the name *Jehovah* (as to which see [§ 25,] Note 2), the following are adduced:—"The representation that all families of the earth are to be blessed in Abraham and his seed," Gen. xii. 3, xviii. 18, xxii. 18, xxvi. 4, xxviii. 14. But this idea, which forms the third point of essential moment in the promise to the patriarchs, is wanting in the fundamental document only because criticism has arbitrarily cut this divine promise out of ch. xxii. (vers. 15–19), and has thus broken off the very point of the narrative.—"The comparison of numerous posterity to the dust of the earth, Gen. xiii. 16, xxviii. 14; to the stars of heaven, xv. 5, xxii. 17, xxvi. 4, Ex. xxxii. 13; and to the sand of the sea, xxii. 17, xxxii. 13." But these figures of speech are neither so constantly used, nor so uncommon in themselves, as to be of any value as distinguishing characteristics. The first is found still in 2 Chron. i. 9; the second in Deut. i. 10, x. 22, xxviii. 62, 1 Chron. xxvii. 23; and the third extremely frequently, Josh. xi. 4, Judg. vii. 12, 1 Sam. xiii. 5, 2 Sam. xvii. 11, 1 Kings iv. 20, v. 9, Isa. x. 22, xlviii. 19, and in the fundamental document itself, Gen. xli. 29; whilst another image used to heighten the promise, "a multitude [and an assemblage] of nations," which is used instead of it in Gen. xvii. 5, xxviii. 3, xxxv. 11, is owing to the occurrence of the name Abraham, "a father of a multitude." [It may also be reasonably alleged, that in Gen. xv. 5 the stars are obviously used in the comparison because Abraham had been brought out to look at them;

perhaps in Gen. xiii. 16 the dust of the earth contains a similar reference to the dust cleaving to his feet, as he finished his pilgrimage through that land which was to be the inheritance of his seed. The metaphors, once introduced in these early promises, would naturally be often repeated with allusion to them, and would become *voces signatæ*.]—"Curses, Gen. iii. 14, 17, iv. 11, ix. 25;" which are also in the fundamental document, Gen. xlix. 6, 7, [but this chapter is now generally assigned to the Jehovist].—"The belief that the sight of God causes death, Gen. xvi. 13, xxxii. 31, Ex. xxxiii. 20," cannot be expected in the fundamental document, because criticism has cut out of it all the visible manifestations of God; yet if we leave Gen. xxxii. to it, with *Tuch* [and *Vaihinger*, at least from ver. 23 onwards], then it also knows of this belief.—"Intentional efforts to furnish etymologies for proper names, Gen. ii. 23, iii. 20, iv. 1, v. 29, xvi. 11, xix. 22, 37, 38, xxv. 25 f., xxvi. 20–22, 33, etc., Ex. ii. 22, xv. 23, and often." This also is not uncommon in the fundamental document; for instance, Gen. xvii. 5, xxv. 30, xli. 51, 52. In neither of them, however, is it constant: it is awanting, for instance, in the supplementer at Gen. iv. 2, 17–22, 26, ix. 18, xxxviii. 2–5, 30: it is found only in names of places and persons when these are of theocratic importance. Comp. *Kurtz*, Beitr. i. p. 109 ff. and 162.—"Enumeration of the various Canaanite races, Gen. xv. 19–21, Ex. iii. 8, 17, xiii. 5, xxiii. 23, 28, xxxiii. 2, xxxiv. 11, Deut. vii. 1, xx. 17." These repeated enumerations are certainly awanting in the passages which criticism has left to the fundamental document: yet there is quite a similar one in Num. xiii. 29,—a passage which criticism has indeed torn away from Num. xiii. 1–16 [not *Vaihinger*, however], but at the expense, *first*, of mutilating the history of the mission of the spies, sending them out, and yet saying nothing of their return; and *secondly*, of making an incomprehensible riddle out of the stay of Israel in the wilderness for forty years, till all the generation that came out of Egypt, except Caleb and Joshua, had died out (a fact to which the fundamental document expressly refers at Num. xxvi. 65).—"A land flowing with milk and honey," Ex. iii. 8, 17, xiii. 5, xxxiii. 3, Deut. vi. 3, xi. 9, xxvi. 9, 15, xxvii. 3, xxxi. 20," is an expression occurring also in Lev. xx. 24, Num. xiii. 27, xiv. 8, and xvi. 13, 14,—passages which can be removed from the fundamental document only by arbitrarily assuming that they have been interpolated and wrought up by a later hand. [*Vaihinger*, accordingly, does give *all* these passages to the Elohist.]—"God's 'strong hand,' Ex. iii. 19, xxxii. 11, Deut. iv. 34, v. 15, and often, and 'house of bondage,' as used of Egypt, Ex. xiii. 3, 14, xx. 2, Deut. v. 6, vi. 12,

and often." Neither expression can be a proof of anything: because, if we except Deuteronomy, they occur only twice or thrice (the former only in Ex. iii. 19, vi. 1, and Num. xx. 20 besides, and there they are applied to *human* power); and because every passage in which we could expect to meet with them has been assigned to the supplementer—Num. xx. 20, for instance—simply on account of "a strong hand" and the angel of Jehovah at ver. 16.—The same is true of "the rod of God, or of Moses," Ex. iv. 2, 20, vii. 19, viii. 1 [12], xiv. 16, xvii. 5, 9: שִׁבְטִים, Ex. v. 6, 10, 14, 15, 19, Num xi. 16, and often in Deut.: נְפִילִים, only Gen. vi. 4 and Num. xiii. 33: חַרְטֻמִּים, in Egypt, Gen. xli. 8, Ex. vii. 11, viii. 3, 14: the "seventy elders," Num. xi. 16, like Ex. xxiv. 1, 9: "Joshua, as the confidant of Moses," Num. xi. 28, like Ex. xxxiii. 11: "The custom of connecting friendships with wells," Gen. xxix. 1–14, xxiv. 11–28, Ex. ii. 15 ff.,—a practice quite common in Oriental antiquity: and many more of the same sort.

The few ideas which do occur only in the one or the other class of sections in the Pentateuch, can furnish no proofs of two different composers; for this reason, that they are neutralized by other ideas, not less peculiar, which occur in both (8).

(8) Common to both is the oath by applying the hand to the thigh, Gen. xxiv. 2, 9 (supplementer) and xlvii. 29 (fundamental document), which is never mentioned again; the peculiar classification of animals (בְּהֵמָה and רֶמֶשׂ and עוֹף הַשָּׁמַיִם), Gen. vi. 7, vii. 8, 23 (suppl.), and vi. 20, vii. 14, 21 [doubtful], viii. 17, 19, ix. 2 [both doubtful] (fund. doc.); comp. *Kurtz*, Einheit d. Gen. p. 37: the representation of the value and power of intercession, xix. 22 ff., xxv. 21 (suppl.), and xx. 7, 17 (fund. doc.): the view that God blesses others for the sake of His own elect, xxx. 27, xxxix. 5 (suppl.), and xix. 29, xxi. 13 (fund. doc.); comp. *Kurtz*, p. 100: the designation of the entire inhabitants of Canaan as Canaanites and Perizzites, xiii. 7 (suppl.) and xxxiv. 30 (fund. doc.). Further compare Gen. xxxv. 1–3 with Ex. xix. 10–14; and see on this subject, *Kurtz*, p. 177; also the peculiarities of the supplementer which are found in Gen. xlix., as given by *Kurtz*, p. 198 f.

Also in respect of the *usus loquendi*, no such difference can be proved to exist in the different sections of the Pentateuch as would indicate that different persons had elaborated or composed it. The discursiveness and the prolix repetitions which have been remarked

in the fundamental document do not pervade it, but are found principally in the first part of Genesis (9), and there also in the sections derived from the supplementer (10). In fact, generally speaking, discursiveness, circumstantiality of narrative, and repetitions, are among the peculiarities of ancient Shemitic historical writing (11); and where they are more strongly prominent, they can be explained by the subject-matter of the narratives, their tendency, and their tone (12).

(9) Even *Tuch*, while attaching value to this distinctive peculiarity, remarks, p. lxiii. f., "that the style in the latter part of Genesis becomes more flexible and fluent than it appeared to be in the beginning;" "that the author passes over other matters with proportionate brevity, gives only a hint of many things, requires to bring them in afterwards where they are necessary to render the history intelligible, and also pursues a subordinate matter till that which is primary escapes from his view, and often becomes awkward and confused."

(10) The supplementer is said "to write more connectedly, with better arrangement, and in an easier style." But even he has "his intricacies, like ch. xxx. 31:" "his verbose repetitions,"—for example, Gen. vii. 2, 3 compared with vers. 8, 9; xviii. 23–32; xxiv. 3–9 compared with vers. 35–41, and vers. 11–26 compared with vers. 42–48; Ex. iii. 7–9 compared with vers. 16, 17, etc.

(11) For proofs of which, see *Ewald*, Komposition d. Gen. p. 145 ff.

(12) As *Tuch* himself has here and there remarked; comp. *Kurtz*, Beitr. i. p. 105 ff., and Einheit d. Gen. p. lix. f.

In so far as the individual marks of distinction between the original document and the supplementary sections are derived from the language, there could be proofs of diversity of authorship only in case the two portions of the Pentateuch used different words and expressions for the same objects. But when we examine the alleged instances more closely, we everywhere discover a difference in the conception, which is demanded by the sense and context of the individual passages (13); or else the peculiar words ascribed to the one author are really not unknown to the other (14); or they occur in a few solitary places, and therefore are not entitled to be considered characteristic (15).

(13) "The supplementer says אִישׁ וְאִשְׁתּוֹ, Gen. vii. 2; the fund. doc. says זָכָר וּנְקֵבָה." But this latter phrase is not unknown to the supplementer—see Gen. vii. 3, 9, Deut. iv. 16 (and זָכָר alone, Ex. xiii. 12, 15, Deut. xv. 19); nor the former to the fund. doc., Num. xxx. 17; and observe אִישׁ וְאִשָּׁה, Ex. xxxvi. 6, Lev. xiii. 29, 38, Num. v. 6, vi. 2, etc. Also both writers use these phrases according as the one or the other is demanded by the thought. The second expression, "male and female," indicates merely the physical distinction of sex in man or beast; on the contrary, the first, "a man and his wife," indicates the ethical personality of human beings, and is never used of animals except in Gen. vii. 2, [where there is an approach to this idea, as the preserved animals, like Noah's family, were to be the parents of the races of a new world]. Comp. *Kurtz*, Beitrr. i. p. 79 ff.—"The supplementer uses הָעְתִּיק for moving one's camp, Gen. xii. 8, xxvi. 22; the fund doc. has נָסַע." But the former writer also has this second word everywhere else—for instance, Gen. xi. 2, xii. 9, xiii. 11, Ex. xii. 37, xiii. 20, xiv. 10, 15, xvii. 1, xix. 2, Num. x. 29, 33, 34, etc.; and only in those two passages does he use the first-named word, which is poetical, being found in prose nowhere else in the whole Old Testament. This fact merely proves that the supplementer, as well as the other author, "now and then becomes poetical in his expressions."—"The supplementer has יָצַר, Gen. ii. 7, 8, 19; the fund. doc. has בָּרָא, Gen. i. 1, 27, ii. 3, etc." But יָצַר is to *form*, or *fashion*, "de conformatione et elaboratione materiæ:" בָּרָא is to *create*, or *make*, "de nova rei productione usurpatur" (*Gesenius*), and is therefore used by the supplementer, Gen. vi. 7, also Ex. xxxiv. 10 and Num. xvi. 30, of working a miracle, also Deut. iv. 32; whereas the other word is nowhere found in the whole Pentateuch except in Gen. ii. Comp. *Kurtz*, p. 94.—"The supplementer has עָתַר, to pray, Gen. xxv. 21, Ex. viii. 4, 5, 24, 26, ix. 28, x. 17, 18; the fund. doc. has הִתְפַּלֵּל, Gen. xx. 7, 17." But the latter word is well known to the supplementer also, comp. Num. xi. 2, xxi. 7, Deut. ix. 20, 26; as the former is not foreign to the fund. doc., as soon as Gen. xxv. 21 is not withdrawn from it by the assumption of an interpolation. Comp. *Kurtz*, Einheit d. Gen. p. 146.—"The fund. doc. has שָׁחַת, Gen. vi. 13, 17, ix. 11, 15; the supplementer has מָחָה, Gen. vi. 7, vii. 4, 23, comp. Ex. xvii. 14, xxxii. 32, 33, Deut. ix. 14, xxv. 6, 19, xxix. 19." But even though Gen. vii. 23 has been withdrawn from the fund. doc. merely on account of this latter word, it still has the word, both in its proper sense and in one that is improper [or derivative], Num. v. 23, xxxiv. 11; as again the former word is used by the supplementer, Gen. xiii. 10, xix. 13, xxxviii 9.

Further, comp. Gen. vi. 11 (fund. doc.) with Ex. viii. 20 (suppl.).—"The fund. doc. uses פַּדַּן אֲרָם; the supplementer uses אֲרָם נַהֲרַיִם." But these appellations are not identical. The former expression, *the plain of Syria*, designates only a district of Mesopotamia,—namely, the environs of the city of Haran, which is situated in a wide level country shut in by mountains; the latter, on the contrary [*Syria of the two rivers*], is Mesopotamia as a whole, or the land between the Euphrates and the Tigris, and in the Pentateuch it occurs only in Gen. xxiv. 10, where the precise spot is named along with it, and in Deut. xxiii. 5. In both cases the expression is perfectly suitable: for in the first of them the immediate object is to tell the country out of which Isaac's wife was to be brought, while the precise spot in this country is designated as "the city of Nahor;" whereas, on later occasions, after the reader has been made acquainted with this country and this place, the neighbourhood can be mentioned under the special name of *Padan Aram*—thus Gen. xxv. 20, xxviii. 2, 5, 7, xxxi. 18, xxxiii. 18, xxxv. 9, xlviii. 7,—the same neighbourhood which Hosea names שְׂדֵה אֲרָם, ch. xii. 13. [Observe also, that in the first four of these passages in Genesis it is designated more precisely by being connected with Bethuel's or Laban's name; whereas by the time it last occurs it is so well known that it is named, in an abbreviated form, only *Padan*.] Again, in Deut. xxiii. 5 Padan Aram could not possibly be used; because Balaam certainly came out of Mesopotamia, but not out of the part of it called Haran. (Quite unfounded is the assertion of *Delitzsch*, Gen. ii. p. 177, that "Aram of the two rivers" *always* stands for it in the Jehovistic portions.)—"In the fund. doc. the laws are almost always introduced by the words, 'And Jehovah spake unto Moses, saying,' Ex. xxv. 1, xxx. 11, 17, 22, xxxi. 1, 12, and very frequently in Leviticus and Numbers; whereas, in the supplementer, 'And he said' predominates" (*Stähelin*, pp. 16 and 29). This proves nothing at all. The only legislative section which criticism has left to the supplementer begins, "And God *spake*," etc., Ex. xx. 1; the fund. doc., again, often uses "And he *said*," with laws, Ex. xii. 1, 43, xxx. 34, xxxi. 12, Lev. xxi. 1, Num. iii. 40, vii. 4, 11, xviii. 1, 20. In the historical sections both writers use the two expressions: "And he *spake*," in the fund. doc., Ex. vi. 2, 9, 10, 12, 13, 29, and in the supplement, Ex. xiv. 1, xxxii. 7, xxxiii. 1, Num. xiii. 1, xiv. 26, etc., also in Deuteronomy; "and he *said*," in the fund. doc., Ex. xvi. 4, Num. xv. 35, xvii. 25, xx. 12, 23, xxv. 4, and in the supplementer, Ex. iv. 11, 19, 21, vi. 1, vii. 1, 14, viii. 1, 12, 16, etc. The difference, that the one expression or the other occurs oftener in the one document than in the other, is to be

explained simply in this way, that criticism has assigned almost all the laws to the fund. doc., and almost all the historical sections in Exodus and Numbers to the supplementer.—"In Ex. xxi.–xxiii. (the supplementer) the individual laws are introduced mostly by כִּי or וְכִי, which is commonly followed by the verb, and that by the subject, ch. xxi. 2, 7, 14, 18, 20, etc.; and where it is practicable, instead of כִּי with the verb, there is the participle, xxi. 12, 15, 16, 17, xxii. 18, 19. On the contrary, in Leviticus the laws are almost always introduced by the words אִישׁ כִּי, or אָדָם כִּי, or נֶפֶשׁ כִּי, or אִישׁ אֲשֶׁר, Lev. i. 2, ii. 1, iv. 2, v. 1, xiii. 2, 38, etc." (*Stähelin*, p. 21 f., compared with pp. 18 and 39). The occasion of this difference, however, is, that in the "Rights of Israel," Ex. xxi.–xxiii., those enacting clauses of the laws which form the predicate of the sentence, refer for the most part not to the subject, but to the object of the first member of the sentence; in which case the subject אִישׁ cannot be placed at the beginning, Ex. xxi. 2 ("When *thou* buyest a Hebrew servant, six years *he* shall serve," etc.), v. 7, xxii. 6, 9, comp. also xxi. 22. In such cases the laws in Leviticus also begin with only כִּי, followed by the verb, and then by the subject, comp. Lev. xxv. 25, 35, 39, 47; and where it is practicable, the participle is used instead of כִּי with the verb, Lev. xxiv. 16, 18, 21.

(14) The following words and phrases are adduced as *Elohistic*, or peculiar to the author of the *fundamental document*:—אֲחֻזָּה, "possession, property," Gen. xvii. 8 and xlviii. 4 (in the divine promise of the land of Canaan), xxiii. 4, 9, 20, xlix. 30, l. 13 (of the burial-place which Abraham purchased from the children of Heth for a possession), xxxvi. 43 (of the possession of the Edomites), and xlvii. 11 (of the land of Goshen), besides Lev. xiv. 34, xxv. 10, etc., xxvii. 16, 21, 22, 28, Num. xxvii. 4, 7, xxxii. 5, xxxv. 2, 8, 28. It occurs, however, also in Num. xxxii. 22, which *Stähelin*, p. 39, is compelled to assign to the supplementer, because it refers to ch. xiii. 11–14; and it cannot be just a favourite expression of the fund. doc., for this reason, that it is not used in all the promises to the patriarchs (not in xxvi. 3, xxxv. 12, where it would have been perfectly suitable), but only in two of them; and when the promise in Gen. xvii. 8 and xlviii. 4 is transferred to Moses, Ex. vi. 8, the word מוֹרָשָׁה is employed instead of it. In the remaining passages אֲחֻזָּה was the only suitable word; and it does not occur in portions of Genesis attributed to the supplementer, only for this reason, that the sense nowhere demanded it, [for the derivation of the word is somewhat analogous to our own *freehold*, or *holding*, and implies such a permanent and firmly-held property as Canaan was to be to Abraham's seed, in con-

trast with its character as *the land of Abraham's own pilgrimage*, Gen. xvii. 8 (observe a word of the same root contrasted with it in his request for a burial-place, xxiii. 4); and therefore in Leviticus and Numbers it has so often a reference, more or less explicit, to this firm hold of Canaan, which Israel was to have, and of which the laws for the jubilee were a marvellous pledge and protection. The same idea seems to be intended even at Gen. xlvii. 4: Goshen was to be a preliminary land of rest for the children of Israel in the intention of both Pharaoh and Joseph; and so at Gen. xxxvi. 43, the firm possession which the Edomites already enjoyed stands in the same contrast to the wanderings of Israel, ver. 7, ch. xxxvii. 1, and down to the time of Moses, as does the Edomite line of kings "before there reigned any king over the children of Israel," ver. 31, although to Israel alone the promise of a settled home and a royal race belonged].—"The repeated use of the word מִין ["kind, sort"], Gen. i. 11, 12, 21, 24, 25, vi. 20, vii. 14; and in the laws as to food, Lev. xi. 14 ff." This is found also in the legislation of the *supplementer*, Deut. xiv. 13 ff.: therefore neither can it be a favourite expression of the fund. document, but it is applied only where the notion of *species* is to be put prominently forward, as in the creation of animals, and in their preservation at the flood, and in the laws as to food; and nowhere else in the fund. doc., nor in the supplementer, nor anywhere else in the Old Testament, except Ezek. xlvii. 10. Comp. *Kurtz*, Beitr. i. p. 91 ff.—"עֶצֶם הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה, Gen. vii. 13, xvii. 23, 26, Ex. xii. 17, 41, 51, Lev. xxiii. 14, 21, 28, 30, Deut. xxxii. 48." This formula is found where the very day spoken of is to be particularly marked out; and it is awanting in the supplementer, because he had no occasion to use it.—"אֶרֶץ מְגוּרִים, Gen. xvii. 8, xxviii. 4, xxxvi. 7, xxxvii. 1, xlvii. 9 (twice), Ex. vi. 4." This certainly does not occur in the supplementer, yet neither is it common in the fund. doc.; while the idea of the patriarchs being pilgrims is also not foreign to the supplementer: comp. for instance Gen. xii. 10, xix. 9, xx. 1, xxi. 34, xxvi. 3—only he uses the *verb* of the same root, as the fund. doc. also does in various places, for instance Gen. xxi. 23, xxxv. 27, Ex. vi. 4. Comp. *Kurtz*, Einheit, p. 184.—"The fund. doc. loves to connect פָּרָה and רָבָה, especially 'Be fruitful and multiply,' Gen. i. 22, 28, viii. 17, ix. 1, 7, xvii. 20, xxviii. 3, xxxv. 11, xlvii. 27, xlviii. 4, Ex. i. 7, Lev. xxvi. 9." This is not convincing. For, first, the apparently great number of passages melt away as soon as we observe the verbally exact reference of viii. 17 and ix. 1, 7 to i. 28, of xlviii. 4 to xxxv. 11, and of Ex. i. 7 to Gen. xlvii. 27: nor, secondly, does the fund. doc. always employ its "favourite expression"

where it might have done so—for instance, not in Gen. i. 22, about the birds, nor in Gen. xvii. 6, xxviii. 14, Ex. i. 10, 12; nor does the supplementer avoid it, where the course of thought necessarily calls for it. Compare *Kurtz*, Beitr. i. p. 89 ff. Nor is it correct to say (with *Delitzsch*) that הִפְרָה, the *Hiphil*, always stands in an Elohistic connection; for Lev. xxvi. 9 is pronounced by the critics not to belong to the fund. doc. on account of its Jehovistic marks.—"The expression רֵיחַ נִיחֹחַ, Ex. xxix. 18, 25, 41, Lev. i. 9, 13, 17, etc.," occurs also in the supplementer, Gen. viii. 21; and if it be only here, this is because the whole sacrificial law is assigned to the fund. doc.—"הֶאֱסַף אֶל־עַמָּיו, Gen. xxv. 8 (of Abraham), xxv. 17 (of Ishmael), xxxv. 29 (of Isaac), xlix. 29, 33 (of Jacob), Num. xx. 24, 26 (of Aaron), and Num. xxvii. 13, Deut. xxxii. 50 (of Moses)," cannot occur in the supplementer, "because the history accompanies none but distinguished personages to the grave, and, without one exception, the narratives of their death are attributed to the fund. doc." (*Kurtz*, Einheit, p. 118).—"בֵּין הָעַרְבַּיִם, of the passover lamb, Ex. xii. 6, Lev. xxiii. 5, Num. ix. 3, 5, 11; of the daily evening sacrifice, Ex. xxix. 39, 41, Num. xxviii. 4; of the lamp-lighting, Ex. xxx. 8; and of the quails being sent, Ex. xvi. 12," cannot be expected in the supplementer, because he is not permitted to have any share in the ritual laws, and the quails were sent at evening only the one time.—"צְבָאוֹת יְהוָה, of the Israelites coming out of Egypt, Ex. xii. 41, vii. 4, and צִבְאוֹתֵיכֶם, Ex. xii. 17; צְבָאוֹת, Ex. vi. 26, xii. 51, Num. xxxiii. 1, and often in the census, Num. i. 3, 52, etc." This mode of expression is explained by the fact that Israel was brought out of Egypt as the people of Jehovah, and was arranged as a military host according to its tribes, families, and fathers' houses; and it is awanting in the supplementer, only because criticism has attributed to the fund. doc., not only the narratives of the coming out from Egypt, but also the mustering, the arrangements for encamping, and the stations.—"נָשֹׂא, Gen. xvii. 20, and frequently in Num. ii., iii., vii., xxxiv., etc.," is well known to the supplementer also; comp. Ex. xxii. 27, xxxiv. 31.—"הֵרִים תְּרוּמָה, Num. xv. 19, 20, and תְּרוּמָה connected with other verbs, Ex. xxv. 2, xxix. 27, 28, etc.;" but only in sacrificial laws, which have been previously reserved for the fund. doc., yet also in Deut. xii. 6, 11, 17. —"עַל פִּי יְהוָה, Ex. xvii. 1, Lev. xxiv. 12, Num. iii. 16, 39, 51, etc.," but also in the supplementer, Num. xiv. 41; and "אֶת־פִּי יי, Num. xxii. 18, xxiv. 13, [a slip of the pen; all three passages have the latter expression].—"מֵאָה in the construct state, only in the fund. doc.," proves nothing: for the fund doc. has the construct twenty-six times, and along with this the absolute twenty-nine times; while in the

passages attributed to the supplementer the word occurs altogether only twice in Genesis—ch. vi. 3, xxvi. 12—and then twice more, in Deut. xxii. 19, xxxi. 2; so seldom, that the construct cannot reasonably be expected.

Among the linguistic peculiarities of the *supplementary* portions there are named the following:—"The frequent use of the emphasizing infinitive absolute; for instance, Gen. ii. 16, 17, iii. 4, 16, xvi. 10, xxx. 16, etc." Yet it is employed in the fund. doc. too, in every place where the thought demands emphasis; for instance, in the one formula "dying shall die," twenty times in the fund. doc., and only nine times in the supplementer; compare besides Gen. xvii. 13, xxxvii. 8, 10, xl. 15, xliii. 7, 20, xliv. 5, 15, Ex. xii. 9, etc.—"נִפְרֹד, Gen. ii. 10, xiii. 9, 11, 14, xxv. 23; comp. xxx. 40 and Deut. xxxii. 8." But it occurs also in Gen. x. 5, 32, which are claimed for the fund. doc. by *Stähelin*, *Movers*, etc. [as xiii. 11*b*, containing one of the instances on the other side, often is also.]—"The suffix מוֹ, Gen. ix. 26, 27, Ex. xxiii. 31, and repeatedly in Ex. xv." This poetical suffix is wanting in the fund. doc., because all the poetical passages in the Pentateuch, except Gen. xlix., are attributed to the supplementer; comp. *Kurtz*, Einheit, p. 55.—"הֵחֵל, to begin, Gen. vi. 1, ix. 20, x. 8;" in the fund. doc. too, Gen. xliv. 12, Lev. xxi. 9, Num. xvii. 11, 12.—"גַּם הוּא, Gen. iv. 4, 26, x. 21;" in the fund. doc. too, Gen. xx. 5, xlviii. 19 twice, etc.—"אֲנָשֵׁי שֵׁם, Gen. vi. 4;" just so in the fund. doc., Num. xvi. 2.—"קָנָה, Gen. xiv. 19, 22, as in Ex. xv. 16." But the word stands in Genesis by the right of creation, and in Exodus by the right of purchase, as it often does in the fund. doc.; for instance, Gen. xxv. 10, xlvii. 22, etc.—"The divine name עֶלְיוֹן, Gen. xiv. 18–20, 22, as Num. xxiv. 16." But in this last text it is poetical, as in Deut. xxxii. 8; and thus it is not analogous to the use in Genesis, and proves nothing.—"נִקְרָה, of meeting God," Ex. iii. 18, Num. xxiii. 3, 4, 16." But in Exodus it is construed with עַל, and is used of a theophany: whereas in Num. ver. 3 it is construed with לִקְרַאת, and at vers. 4 and 16 with אֶל, and is used of the prophetic revelation of His word; finally, in Gen. xxiv. 12, xxvii. 20, it means *to cause to meet, to send to meet.* So that here there is no characteristic similarity either in the matter or the language.—"בּוֹא אֶל־אִשָּׁה, Gen. xvi. 2, 4, xxix. 21, 30, xxx. 3, 4, xxxviii. 2, [9], 16:" never again in the Pentateuch, because the thought is awanting (comp. *Kurtz*, Einheit, p. 157); besides, Gen. xxix. and xxx. are assigned to the fund. doc. by *Tuch* and *De Wette*.—"מַה זֹּאת עָשִׂיתָ, Gen. iii. 13, xii. 18, xxvi. 10, xxix. 25, xlii. 28, Ex. xiv. 11." But ch. xxix., xlii., according to *Tuch* and *De Wette*, belong to the fund. doc., which also has the same formula, only wanting זֹּאת, in Gen. xx. 9;

as has also the supplementer, Gen. iv. 10, xxxi. 26, Num. xxiii. 11. He therefore has not so much as used the same formula throughout. —"כִּי־עַל־כֵּן, Gen. xviii. 5, xix. 8, xxxiii. 10, xxxviii. 26, Num. x. 31, xiv. 43." Not again in the Pentateuch; and Gen. xxxiii. 10 belongs to the fund. doc., according to *Tuch*.—"חָנַן אֶת־לֵב, Ex. iv. 21, etc." But the true state of the case is this. The hardening of Pharaoh is mentioned altogether twenty times in Ex. iv.–xiv.: twelve times as ordained for him by God, with the verb חָזַק, iv. 21, ix. 12, x. 20, 27, xi. 10, xiv. 4, 8, 17, with הִכְבִּיד, viii. 11, 28, x. 1, and with הִקְשָׁה, vii. 3: and eight times as the guilty act of Pharaoh himself, with חָזַק, vii. 13, 22, viii. 15, ix. 35; כָּבֵד, vii. 14, ix. 7; הִכְבִּיד, ix. 34; and הִקְשָׁה, xiii. 15. Now, as only a very small part of this long section, ch. vi. 2–vii. 7, is left to the fund. doc., and as the hardening of Pharaoh is only once mentioned here, of course all the four ways of denoting this conception cannot occur, but only one, which is הִקְשָׁה, vii. 3. [In the more complicated partition of this section which is now in fashion, the verb חָזַק is freely allowed to both fund. doc. and supplementer, and probably קָשָׁה, which occurs only twice; whereas כָּבֵד is confined to the latter, unless perhaps ch. viii. 11 be Elohistic.]—"נֵס, Ex. xvii. 15, Num. xxi. 8, 9, xxvi. 10." But in these three places, in which alone we find the word in the Pentateuch, it bears three different significations: a banner employed by God, the pole for the brazen serpent, and a sign or warning, [and the last seems unquestionably to belong to what is called the fund. doc.].

(15) Such are the following expressions in the *fund. doc.* on which stress is laid:—גֵּר וְתוֹשָׁב, Gen. xxiii. 4, Lev. xxv. 23, 35, 47, Num. xxxv. 15 (never again united); comp. *Kurtz*, Einheit, p. 116.—בְּפֶרֶךְ, *with harshness*, joined to the verb עָבַד, Ex. i. 13, 14, or רָדָה, Lev. xxv. 43, 46, 53.—שְׁפָטִים, only Ex. vi. 6, vii. 4, xii. 12, Num. xxxiii. 3.—מֶכֶס only in Num. xxxi. 28, 37–41, and מַכְסָה, Ex. xii. 4 (where alone too the verb כָּסַס occurs) and Lev. xxvii. 23.—Just such, too, are the words and phrases marked in the *supplementary passages*. תַּרְדֵּמָה only in Gen. ii. 21 and xv. 12.—תְּשׁוּקָה only in Gen. iii. 16 and iv. 7.—גְּבוֹר only in Gen. vi. 4, x. 8, 9, and in Deut. x. 17 of God.—בְּגִלָּל only in Gen. xii. 13, xxx. 27, xxxix. 5, and Deut. i. 37, xv. 10, xviii. 12.—סָפָה, *to sweep away*, only in Gen. xviii. 23, 24, xix. 15, 17, Num. xvi. 26, Deut. xxix. 18.—לִפְנוֹת עֶרֶב, Gen. xxiv. 63, Deut. xxiii. 12; and לִפְנוֹת בֹּקֶר only in Ex. xiv. 27.—אָצַל, Gen. xxvii. 36, Num. xi. 17, 25.—פָּנִים אֶל־פָּנִים only Gen. xxxii. 31, Ex. xxxiii. 11, and Deut. xxxiv. 10; comp. פָּנִים בְּפָנִים, Deut. v. 4.—The infinitive נְתֹן only Gen. xxxviii. 9 and Num. xx. 21; on the contrary, the common form תֵּת forty-two times in the supplementer.—פָּרַע only in Ex. v. 4

(*Hiphil*) and xxxii. 25 (*Kal*, twice).—מַחֲלָה only in Ex. xv. 26 and xxiii. 25.—הַר הָאֱלֹהִים only in Ex. iii. 1, iv. 27, xviii. 5, xxiv. 13; and הַר יְהוָה, Num. x. 33: much oftener "Mount Sinai" alone; for instance, Ex. xix. 11, 18, 20, 23, xxiv. 16, xxxiv. 2, 4, 32.—רְגָלִים, *times*, Ex. xxiii. 14, Num. xxii. 28, 32; not again in the whole Old Testament.—כִּסֵּה אֶת־עֵין הָאָרֶץ, Ex. x. 5, 15, of the locusts, and Num. xxii. 5, 11, of the innumerable multitudes of the Israelites: never again in the Old Testament.—If expressions of this sort, which occur only two or three times, prove a diversity of authorship, then identity of authorship must equally be proved by other words not less characteristic, occurring just as often, only in both sections: like בָּשָׂר, of mankind, in Gen. vi. 3 (supplementer) and vi. 12, 13 (fund. doc.), and besides only in Deut. v. 26 [or ver. 23, according to another mode of numbering]; and נִשְׁמַת חַיִּים, Gen. ii. 7 (supplementer) and vii. 22 (fund. doc.).—And generally, this argument loses all its cogency owing to the fact that, in order to carry it out, its authors are compelled to have recourse to numberless "re-touchings," and to concede to not a few sections in Genesis the linguistic peculiarities of both documents, on which account they fall into endless disputes with one another about the division of individual passages among the various composers whom they imagine to have existed. Of this I have presented a more detailed view in *Häv.* Einl. i. 2, § 114, 115, and 117.

The only sure result from an unprejudiced analysis, arising out of certain peculiarities in individual passages in Genesis, such as the longer genealogies, ch. v., x. 10 ff., xxxvi., and others, and in some single narratives like ch. xiv. and xxiii., is this, that Moses has made use of ancient documents (comp. *Häv.* i. 2, § 116). More than this we cannot discover. Nor can we admit that the view of *V. v. Strauss*, in his Gedanken üb. d. Entstehung d. Genesis, in the Zeitschrift f. Protestantism. u. Kirche 1856, vol. xxxii. p. 209 ff., is invested with any probability,—namely this, that Moses wrought up in a written form an Elohistic tradition which was in the mouths of those Israelites who lived isolated in Goshen, and a Jehovistic tradition of those who lived dispersed among the Egyptians.

§ 28. *Relation of Deuteronomy to the earlier Books.*

Deuteronomy is distinguished from the three intermediate books of the Pentateuch by its hortatory tendency. The recent criticism has made use of this difference for the purpose of denying the identity of the authorship, or the original unity of the composition of

this and the earlier parts of the Pentateuch (1), and of finding an entirely new legislation in Deuteronomy. This view is owing to a total misapprehension of the peculiar object and the entire tendency of this book: these are simply to inculcate once more upon the people merely the principal contents of the earlier legislation, and to supplement it by appending various important laws in reference to the future residence of the people in the land of Canaan. To this the lawgiver felt himself impelled at the close of his life, so as to conclude the legislation before his death (2).

(1) According to *Vatke* (bibl. Theol.), *P. v. Bohlen*, and *George* (die älteren jüd. Feste, Berlin 1835), [and Dr. *Samuel Davidson* in his edition of *Horne's* Introduction, though he has since abandoned this view], the legislation of Deuteronomy is to be considered earlier than that of the three intermediate books; an assertion which is based upon a pseudo-philosophic construction of history, and needs no further refutation. Comp. against it the *Studien u. Krit.* 1837, p. 953 ff., and *Ranke*, ii. p. 361 ff. According to the rest of the critics, Deuteronomy must have been composed either by the supplementer of the fundamental document—that is, the author of the Jehovistic portions of Genesis and the second legislation (*Bleek*, in *Rosenmüller*, Repert. i. p. 48 ff., although he speaks of two redactions [and in his Einleitung, p. 292, he disclaims this opinion, and agrees with the critics about to be mentioned]; *Stähelin*, üb. d. Pent. p. 72 ff.); or by a third author, who is to be distinguished equally from the Elohist and the Jehovist (*De Wette*, Einl. § 155 ff.; *C. v. Lengerke*, p. cviii. ff.; *Ewald*; and *Ed. Riehm*, d. Gesetzgebung Mosis im Lande Moab, Gotha 1854).

(2) The legislation contained in Deuteronomy is said to represent itself as *new*, not only with reference to the point of time selected, but also with reference to its later character (*De Wette*, § 156, *b*). Yet *v. Lengerke* himself acknowledges, p. cix., that when the author "makes Moses say (Deut. xxviii. 58, 61, xxix. 19) that he has written *this* Law—that is, the proper second Law, ch. iv. 49 ff. (?)—in *this* book, or in the book of *this* Law (comp. Deut. xxxi. 9 ff.), he did not wish to say that there lay before him a separate document which he traced back to Moses, and which he wished to distinguish from his own (historical) additions, as he wished to distinguish his own person from that of Moses," but that "he meant the book into which Deuteronomy was inserted—the Pentateuch." The date of the addresses also, which form the contents of Deuteronomy, and partly

repeat the Law and inculcate it anew, partly supplement and perfect it for the residence of the people in the promised land, is transferred, by the geographical and chronological statement in Deut. i. 1–5, to the residence of Israel in the plains of Moab, and in the eleventh month of the fortieth year of the journeying; and thus they are placed in the closest connection with the last sections of the fourth book. It is quite arbitrary in *De Wette* to interpret the concluding formula, Num. xxxvi. 13, "These are the commandments and the judgments which the Lord commanded, by the hand of Moses, unto the children of Israel in the plains of Moab," to this effect, that the fourth book contains the *whole latest* Mosaic legislation during the stay in the plains of Moab, so that the Elohist knew of no subsequent event except the death of Moses (Deut. xxxiv.). Against this view, comp. *Ranke*, ii. p. 320 ff. There is just as little reason for inferring "an entirely new legislation" from the facts "that in Deuteronomy Moses himself speaks directly to the people, and not God through Moses; and that everything is traced back immediately to God, passing over the Angel of Jehovah" (*De Wette*). The *former* circumstance is rather an evidence that this book means to deliver no new legislation, but that Moses wishes to bring home to the heart of the people, and to complete, the law already given, with its testimonies, statutes, and rights. And the *latter* shows precisely the complete agreement of Deuteronomy with the earlier books, according to which God sends His angel before the people, yet in the angel reveals Himself: so that it is not the angel, but Jehovah Himself, who confounds the enemies of Israel, sends hornets before Israel, and expels the Canaanites (Ex. xxiii. 20–30); and consequently all the laws are so given, that it is Jehovah (not the angel) who speaks to Moses. Not only in Deuteronomy, but also in the earlier books, all actions and all laws are traced back immediately to Jehovah (comp. Deut. vii. 20 and xi. 13 ff. with Ex. xxiii. 25–30; and in respect of the laws, comp. Deut. v. 4 ff., vi. 1, 17, 24, viii. 6, etc., with Ex. xx. 1), so that here there reigns perfect agreement; as the Deuteronomist also knows perfectly well that Jehovah has led Israel בְּפָנָיו, "with His presence" (Deut. iv. 37 compared with Ex. xxxiii. 14).

§ 29. *The Contents of Deuteronomy compared with those of the earlier Books.*

The intimate connection of Deuteronomy with the preceding books is generally acknowledged (1). Nevertheless, it is said to contain deviations, additions, and contradictions, both in the historical

accounts and in the legislation, which exclude the belief in the unity of composition of the whole of the books by a *single* author (2).

(1) Not only by *Ranke*, i. p. 147 ff., and *König*, Alttestl. Studien, ii. p. 122 ff. (Berlin 1839); but also by *De Wette*, Studien u. Krit. 1830, p. 353 ff., Einleit. § 143; *v. Lengerke*, p. cx.; *Ewald*, and others. In Deuteronomy the knowledge of the historical and legislative contents of the preceding books is presupposed. The author repeatedly recalls to memory the promises of God to the patriarchs, whose fulfilment has partly taken place already, and partly remains to be accomplished (for instance, Deut. i. 7, 8, 11, iv. 31, vi. 10, vii. 8, 12, 13, viii. 1, 18, ix. 5, x. 11, 22, xi. 9, 21, etc.; comp. *König*, p. 126 ff.); refers back to the great things God had done for His people in Egypt, and to all the chief events during the forty years' journeying in the wilderness (for instance, Deut. i. 9 ff., referring to Ex. xviii. 18 ff.; Deut. i. 4 to Num. xxi. 24–35; Deut. i. 6 to Num. x. 11 ff.; Deut. i. 19 to Num. xx. 1; Deut. i. 22 to Num. xiii. 3–xiv. 10; Deut. i. 33 to Ex. xiii. 21, 22; Deut. i. 34 ff. to Num. xiv. 23 ff.; Deut. iv. 34 and vii. 18 to Ex. vi.–xi.; Deut. viii. 3 to Ex. xvi. 15 ff.; Deut. ix. 7 ff. to Ex. xvi., xvii. 7, xxxii.; Deut. ix. 22 ff. to Ex. xvii. 1 ff., Num. xi., etc.); not only mentions the legislation at Sinai, with all the historical circumstances (for instance, Deut. iv. 10 ff., v. 2, 4 ff., 22 ff., etc.), but also repeats the most important individual laws, on the fulfilling of which would depend the prosperity of His people in the land of promise (for instance, Deut. v. 6 ff., the ten commandments, comp. Ex. xx. 1 ff.; the laws about food, Deut. xiv., comp. Lev. xi.; the laws about the annual feasts, Deut xvi., comp. Ex. xii. 1 ff., xxiii. 17, xxxiv. 23, Lev. xxiii. 4 ff., etc., taking for granted that the rest are known). See this at full length in *König*, pp. 130–146.

(2) Comp. particularly *De Wette*, Einl. § 156, *a*; *v. Lengerke*, p. cviii. ff.; *Ewald*, Geschichte, i. p. 156 ff.; *Riehm*, and others.

However, the *deviations* in respect of historical relations are to be explained by this, as a whole, that the hortatory object of the author leads him to touch upon earlier occurrences mostly in the way of mere allusion, to give prominence to the subjective motives for the events, and to connect similar incidents according to their internal affinities, without reference to the chronological order (3). The historical *additions* consist partly in the prominence given to individual circumstances in the history, which are passed over in the earlier

books as things to be understood of themselves; partly in more important historical accounts which presuppose the most exact acquaintance with the Mosaic age and history (4). Finally, the *contradictions*, taken as a whole or one by one, are only apparent, and for the most part are easily adjusted (5).

(3) Thus, at ch. ix. 22 ff., the rebellions of Israel against Jehovah at Taberah, at Massah, and at Kibroth-hattaavah, are connected with the idolatry at Sinai, which gives rise to no difference that imperils our belief in one narrator of these events.—Again, when it is said, Deut. i. 37, iii. 26, iv. 21, as the reason why Moses was forbidden to enter the promised land, "The Lord was angry with me for your sakes," this just expresses plainly what is implied in Num. xx. 12 and xxvii. 14, that Moses transgressed in twice smiting the rock, to which God commanded him to speak, that it might yield water, Num. xx. 8; and this is expressly mentioned in Deut. xxxii. 51. Comp. *Hengstb.* Beitrr. iii. p. 425 f. Deut. i. 37 does not contain an assertion that this sentence was pronounced upon Moses at the same time that the people were condemned to die in the wilderness; for the thought in this verse is merely parenthetic. Comp. *Stähelin*, p. 74.—Also the divine command, Deut. ii. 19, 37, not to make war with the Ammonites, but to march past their frontier, is so far from conflicting with the account in Num. xxi. 24, "For the border of the children of Ammon was strong," that it is this fact which first makes it perfectly plain.—Again, when the making of the second tables for the commandments is coupled with the making of the ark, Deut. x. 1 ff., whereas the ark was made later, according to Ex. xxxiv. 1 ff. and xxxvii. 1 ff., it is easy to adjust this by considering that in Deut. x. the order of time is supposed to be already known, [or that it is left out of account, being of no importance to the writer's object], and that these two parts of the sanctuary are coupled on account of their internal mutual connection; for confessedly the *Vav* of consecution is frequently an expression of connection purely in order of thought, and not only in order of time. Comp. besides, *Hengstb.* p. 388.—Finally, Deut. x. 8 (where "at that time" refers back to ver. 5, and combines the separation of the tribe of Levi with the renewal of the covenant at Horeb) conflicts just as little with the narrative of the consecration of the Levites in Num. viii.; because this consecration presupposes their having been already chosen, that choice being founded upon the fidelity to Jehovah which this tribe had manifested at Horeb, Ex. xxxii. 26–29. Comp. besides, *Hengstb.* p. 428.

(4) Additions of the former sort are, for instance, the command

of God when the camp at Horeb was broken up, Deut. i. 6, 7, comp. Num. x. 11; the account given in ch. i. 46, "Ye abode in Kadesh many days;" what is said at ver. 45 of the repentance of the Israelites, which is not found in Num. xiv. (while, on the contrary, the fast of Moses upon Mount Sinai for forty days, Deut. ix. 9, 18, which *De Wette* misses in Ex. xxiv. and xxxii., is mentioned in Ex. xxxiv. 28); the intercession of Moses for Aaron, Deut. ix. 20, of which we read nothing in Ex. xxxii. or xxxiii.—Additions of the latter sort are: Deut. ii. 9, 18, the command not to make war upon the Moabites and Ammonites, and so with the Edomites, instead of which they were to buy food and water from them while marching through their territory, vers. 4–8; the old historical notices about the most ancient inhabitants of Mount Seir, and of the territory of the Moabites and Ammonites, ch. ii. 10–12, 20–23; about the sixty strong cities of Bashan, ch. iii. 4, 5; about the various names of Hermon, ch. iii. 9; about Og, king of Bashan, ch. iii. 11; the account of the place, "the wilderness of Kedemoth," from which Moses sent messengers to king Sihon, ch. ii. 26 (not named in Num. xxi. 21); the more precise details about the attack by the Amalekites, ch. xxv. 17, 18 (compared with Ex. xvii. 8 ff.); and other little additions.

More important are the additions in the legislative sections. The following laws are new:—In Deut. iv. 41–43, the appointment of the three cities of refuge east of Jordan, as directed in Num. xxxv. 14; whereas the command to set apart three cities on the west side is merely repeated in Deut. xix. 9. In ch. xii. 5 ff., the laws about the one place of worship which God would appoint, abrogating the arrangement made in Lev. xvii. 3 ff. about slaughtering animals only beside the tabernacle: in this there is presupposed the knowledge of the whole sacrificial law. In ch. xii. 11, 17, xiv. 22 ff., xxvi. 12, about the tithes appointed for the sacrificial feasts. In ch. xiii., about false prophets, seducers of the people, and those who should be seduced to idolatry. In ch. xvii. 14 ff., about the kingdom. In xviii. 15 ff., about the prophetic office. In ch. xx., about making war, and military service. In ch. xxi., about a person murdered no one knew how; about female captives; about polygamy and primogeniture; about punishment of a rebellious son; and about a person hanged. In ch. xxii. 13 ff., about unchastity and rape. In ch. xxiv. 1 ff., about divorce. In ch. xxvii. 2 ff., about erecting stones for a memorial of the law. Also in ch. xxii. 5 ff., xxiii., and xxv., various minor laws; and in ch. xxvi., the form of thanksgiving when first-fruits and tithes were presented. The remaining laws of the intermediate books are only in part repeated and inculcated anew; and some single ones are

extended, like the law about Hebrew slaves in ch. xv. 12 ff., compared with Ex. xxi. 2 ff.

(5) The greater part of the many contradictions which *Vater*, *De Wette* (Beiträge), *Hartmann*, and others had discovered between Deuteronomy and the earlier books of Moses, has been so completely set aside by *Ranke*, *Hengstb.*, and *Häv.*, that *De Wette* (Einl. § 156, *a*, notes *b* and *e*) has adhered firmly only to a few isolated instances; while *Stähelin* (p. 72 ff.), and even *v. Lengerke* (p. cxi. f.), account these also to be worthless. And they are perfectly right. For if, according to ch. ii. 29 compared with ver. 6, the Edomites and Moabites sold food and water to the Israelites, and yet, according to ch. xxiii. 5, they [namely, the Moabites and Ammonites] did not go out to meet them with bread and water; this want of friendliness, manifested in not meeting them, does not exclude, but rather includes, the sale of these things for money: comp. *Hengstb.* p. 286.—The assertion that the choice of the judges is placed later in Deut. i. 9–18 than in Ex. xviii. 13 ff., rests upon too narrow a conception of the import of "at that time," ver. 9, which affirms only that it was during the stay at Horeb, as appears from a comparison with the same phrase at ver. 18. Deuteronomy, indeed, does not mention the advice of Jethro; but this is easily explained, inasmuch as nothing depended here on the more particular mention of the circumstances of the institution: comp. *Ranke*, ii. p. 273 ff.; *Hengstb.* p. 414; *Stähelin*, p. 73. [*Vaihinger* also, p. 364, reckons Ex. xviii. to be plainly an interpolation, since Jethro came "to the mount of God," which is Sinai according to ch. xxiv. 13, to which, however, Israel did not come till ch. xix. 2; and he says we have the true account in Deuteronomy, which places the institution at the end of the long stay in Horeb, when the Israelites were about to march. See his opinion already given, with some remarks, in § 26, Note 1, p. 111. Were this granted, it would only prove that Jethro's advice had not been adopted, or, though adopted, had not been fully carried into execution till after the busy period of the legislation.]—When in Deut. i. 22 the *people* make the proposal to send out the spies, whereas in Num. xiii. 3 the same act is the command of *God*, the adjustment is the simplest possible: that the thought originated with the people, was laid by Moses before God, and was by Him commanded. Comp. *Hengstb.* p. 419; *Stähelin*, p. 73.—When in Deut. i. 44 *Amorites* are named instead of *Canaanites* (not *Amalekites*, as *De Wette* still asserts) in Num. xiv. 45, it is because the Amorites, as the most powerful of the Canaanite races, stand for all the Canaanites here, as in Gen. xv. 16, Deut. i. 7; and the Amalekites are passed over in ch. i. 44 with only a slight

hint of them by the words "in Seir," where they lived, according to 1 Chron. iv. 42, 43. Comp. *Hengstb.* p. 421 ff.—Though, according to Num. xx. 14–21, the Edomites refused a passage through their land to the Israelites with military force, so that Israel drew back, whereas according to Deut. ii. 3–8 Israel marched through the territory of Edom, there is no contradiction in this: the former account is of an occurrence in the neighbourhood of Kadesh, where the Edomites ventured to meet the Israelites with hostility, because they were protected by a country with steep mountain ridges; the latter is of an occurrence in the south-eastern part of Edom, not far from Eziongeber, where they could not hinder the passage, because here they were afraid of the might of the Israelites. Comp. *Hengstb.* pp. 283–4; *C. v. Raumer*, d. Zug der Israel, pp. 44, 45; and *Winer*, bibl. Real-Wörterbuch, i. p. 293, note.—The difference which obtains in respect of the encampments between Num. xx. 23, xxxiii. 30 ff., and Deut. x. 6, 7, although not yet completely cleared up (comp. *Hengstb.* p. 427 ff.; *Winer*, R.W. ii. 703 ff.; and *Kurtz*, Gesch. d. Alten Bundes, ii. p. 369), can, however, not be used for critical conclusions about the author of Deuteronomy.—Finally, there is the difference in the names of the place of the legislation, which is called *Horeb* throughout Deuteronomy (i. 6, 19, iv. 10, 15, v. 2, ix. 8, xviii. 16, xxviii. 69), except *Sinai* in xxxiii. 2; while, on the contrary, it is *Sinai* in Ex. xix. 2, 18, 23, xxiv. 16, xxxi. 18, xxxiv. 29, 32, Lev. vii. 38, xxv. 1, xxvi. 46, Num. i. 1, iii. 1, 14, xxvi. 64, xxviii. 6, xxxiii. 15, 16, and *Horeb* only in Ex. iii. 1, xvii. 6, xxxiii. 6. This is to be explained by the consideration that *Horeb* denotes the entire mass of mountains in that neighbourhood, as Ex. xvii. 6 sufficiently shows, for according to it *Rephidim* lay at *Horeb;* and that, on the contrary, Sinai is the special name for that individual mountain on which the Law was given, which could not come into view earlier than the history of the giving of the Law in Ex. xix.: while in Deuteronomy, again, it retires into the background, as the rhetorical style of this book demands the more general and well-known name of *Horeb* for the scene of the legislation at *Sinai*, in contrast with the legislation "*in the land of Moab*," Deut. i. 5, xxviii. 69. [Observe also the use of the prepositions, *in* Horeb and *on* Sinai.]

As for the contradictions discovered in the laws, the observation of *Bertheau*, die sieben Gruppen mos. Gesetze (Göttingen 1840), p. 19, note, is sufficient: "Throughout it seems to me hazardous to assume contradictions in the laws, and to draw conclusions from them as to the varying age of the contradictory passages. . . . He who makes additions is certainly acquainted with the document to which they are

attached; and either he has adopted nothing that is contradictory, or else he has erased from that document whatever would contradict the additions." The individual alleged contradictions are resolved and removed by *Ranke*, by *Hengstb.*, and in *M. Baumgarten's* commentary on the passages in question. Comp. also *Häv.* i. 2, p. 426 ff., in the second edition.

Now, if all the differences are resolved into harmony by unprejudiced and careful consideration, they bear witness *in favour* of the unity of composition, not against it: for only one and the same author of the entire Pentateuch could move so freely; whereas any later writer would have kept anxiously to the earlier accounts, and would have avoided every appearance of contradiction (6).

(6) There is no foundation for the assertion of *Ewald*, Gesch. i. pp. 168–9, and *v. Lengerke*, p. cx., that "the late writer of Deuteronomy" had peculiar sources of information at his command, out of which he has extracted the more important historical accounts, or additions, which are peculiar to himself.

§ 30. *The usus loquendi in Deuteronomy.*

Deuteronomy contains discourses whose contents are hortatory. If these are to correspond to their object, they must be distinguished from the simple narrative of events and the measured language of the objective legislation, not only by a certain copiousness of diction, but also by many peculiar words. It betrays a small knowledge of mind to make the hortatory tendency and form of the book pass for a mark of different authorship (1). Why should not Moses, with "a mind of unparalleled greatness, who acts with a primeval strength of his own independent of all history, who makes a revelation of divine things, and more or less carries out what has been given to him," "a prophet in whom we must acknowledge one of the most marvellous of minds of original power" (2), before the close of his earthly career "have struck another key," so as to press urgently upon the hearts of his people the observance of all the laws, as well those already given as those still to be added bearing upon their residence in Canaan? The rhetorical, hortatory aim of Deuteronomy explains all its peculiar words and phrases; the most of which belong to the poetical element

in rhetorical diction, though many are also adduced as peculiar to it, without really being so (3).

(1) As *De Wette*, Einl. § 156, *a* [and *Bleek*, p. 298, referring to him], and *v. Lengerke*, p. cxvii., still do.

(2) The words of *Ewald*, Geschichte d. Volks Israel, ii. pp. 24, 29, 32–3.

(3) So שָׁמַר לַעֲשׂוֹת, v. 1, 29, vi. 3, 25, and often; דָּבַק בַּיהוָֹה, iv. 4, x. 20, and often; מִשְׁלַח יָד, xii. 7, xv. 10, xxiii. 21, xxviii. 8, 20; מַעֲשֵׂה יָד, ii. 7, xiv. 29, and often; עַשְׁתְּרוֹת צֹאן, vii. 13, xxviii. 4, 18, 51: the poetical combinations "God of gods," "heaven of heavens," comp. 1 Kings viii. 27; and the words הִתְנָּרֶה, ii. 4 [24 ?], 5, 9, 19, comp. Prov. xxviii. 4, and the *Piel*, Prov. xv. 18, xxviii. 25, xxix. 22; נָדַח [*Kal*, *Niph.*, and *Hiph.*], Deut. xx. 19, iv. 19, xiii. 6, 11, 14, xix. 5, and often, comp. the *Hiphil* in Ps. v. 11, lxii. 5, Prov. vii. 21, and the *Niphal*, Isa. xi. 12, xvi. 3; הִרְפָּה with the accusative, iv. 31, xxxi. 6, 8, like Cant. iii. 4, Job vii. 19: further, the poetical Chaldaisms, וַיֵּתֵא for ויאתא, xxxiii. 21; אָזְלַת, xxxii. 36; הַיּוֹצֵת, xxviii. 57; תֶּשִׁי from נָשָׁה, xxxii. 18; perhaps also יַדְבֵּק, יוֹלֵךְ, xxviii. 21, 36, which *De Wette*, as above quoted, reckons to the later *usus loquendi* of this book, just as mistakenly as when he gives out that other words and expressions are peculiar to it, while they are found in the other books of the Pentateuch. Such are הִשָּׁמֶר לְךָ (also the plural pronoun), iv. 9, vi. 12, and often; also Gen. xxiv. 6, xxxi. 24, 29*, Ex. x. 28, xix. 12, xxxiv. 12: הָאָרֶץ הַטּוֹבָה, i. 35, iii. 25, also Ex. iii. 8; and טוֹבָה הָאָרֶץ מְאֹד, Num. xiv. 7, like Deut. i. 25: נָתַן לִפְנֵי, "to set or give before," i. 8, 21, ii. 31, and often, as Ex. xxx. 36*, 1 Kings ix. 6: הָדַף, vi. 19, ix. 4, with מִפְּנֵי, "to push, to drive out from before;" also Num. xxxv. 20, 22* (without the preposition), "to push or drive:" כַּיּוֹם הַזֶּה, ii. 30, iv. 20, and often; also Gen. l. 20*: גֹּדֶל, v. 21, like Num. xiv. 19: the infinitive absolute הֵיטֵב, ix. 21, xiii. 15, and often; also Gen. xxxii. 13: שִׁכֵּל, "to bereave," xxxii. 25; as Gen. xlii. 36*, Ex. xxiii. 26, Lev. xxvi. 22: בִּעֵר, "to bring to nothing, to consume utterly away," xix. 13, like Num. xxiv. 22; although this verb with הָרָע מִקִּרְבֶּךָ, xiii. 6, xvii. 7, and often, is not found in the earlier books, because it expresses a subjective notion, the fiery heat of consuming hatred directed against evil, which is excluded by the objective character of the earlier legislation: the frequent combination of *law*, or *laws*, and *statutes*, or *testimonies*, or *commandments*, or *judgments*, v. 28, vi. 1, 17, 20, vii. 11, viii. 11, xi. 1, xxvi. 17, xxx. 16; not foreign to the earlier books, however, comp. Gen. xxvi. 5, Lev. xxvi. 15, and more frequent in Deuteronomy only on account of its continual retrospective reference

to the complex whole of the earlier legislation. Still less can the feminine infinitives, יִרְאָה, אַהֲבָה, etc., be regarded as characteristic of Deuteronomy, since they are frequent in all the books of the Pentateuch, and also are not rare in other books; for instance, חֲמָלָה, Gen. xix. 16; זְקֻנָה, Gen. xxiv. 36; קְרֻבָה, Ex. xxxvi. 2*, xl. 32*, Lev. xvi. 1*; טֻמְאָה, Lev. v. 26* [? it is found in Lev. xv. 32, xviii. 20, 23, xix. 31, xxii. 8, and in Ezekiel]; רִבְעָה, Lev. xx. 16, etc.: comp. *Ewald*, ausf. Lehrbuch, § 238, *a*. In proof that these expressions do not occur only in the Jehovistic sections of the earlier books, which are attributed to the so-called supplementer, an asterisk has been attached to those which occur in the fundamental document.—Just as little can it be proved, from the affinity of the *usus loquendi* in Deuteronomy to the language of Jeremiah, that certain of its phrases have been adopted from him: like דִּבֶּר סָרָה עַל, Deut. xiii. 6, in Jer. xxviii. 16, xxix. 32 (comp. Isa. lix. 13); זְעָוָה, Deut. xxviii. 25, for which, however, Jeremiah constantly uses the later form זִוָּעָה (xv. 4, xxiv. 9, xxix. 18, xxxiv. 17, also 2 Chron. xxix. 8; comp. *Häv.* Einl. i. 1, p. 201), [all these in the *Kethîb*], whereas the original form occurs in Ezek. xxiii. 46; שְׁרִירוּת לֵב is found already in Ps. lxxxi. 13; נָתַשׁ, Deut. xxix. 27, already in Amos ix. 15, Mic. v. 13; לֶקַח, "doctrine," Deut. xxxii. 2, already frequently in Proverbs, Job, and Isa. xxix. 24.—The thoroughgoing diversity of the language of Deuteronomy from that of Jeremiah has been shown strikingly by *König*, ii. p. 12 ff.; and what *Delitzsch*, Genesis, i. pp. 29, 30, last of all, has adduced in support of the peculiar *usus loquendi* of Deuteronomy, is shown in *Häv.* Einl. i. 2, p. 182 ff., not to be convincing.

Besides, Deuteronomy agrees perfectly with the earlier books of the Pentateuch in their antique *usus loquendi*, both with the Jehovistic or supplementary portions, and with the Elohistic elements, the so-called fundamental document (4); and in addition, it has many peculiar words and phrases in common with them (5): so that it is quite impossible to speak with any propriety of such a peculiar *usus loquendi* in this book as would indicate a difference of authorship.

(4) Particularly the antique forms הוּא and נַעַר for the feminine, both occurring throughout, as in the Jehovistic and Elohistic portions of the earlier books indifferently; נַעֲרָה appears only in Deut. xxii. 19, on which we must lay the less weight (with *Ewald*, Gesch. i. p. 179, and *v. Lengerke*, p. cxv.), since הוּא stands in Deuteronomy absolutely without exception, whereas the Masoretic text presents the form הִיא

eleven times in the preceding books, which are confessedly older—Gen. xiv. 2, xx. 5, xxxviii. 25, Lev. ii. 15, xi. 39, xiii. 10, 21, xvi. 31, xxi. 9, Num. v. 13, 14. In addition, הָאֵל for הָאֱלֹה, Deut. iv. 42, vii. 22, xix. 11, like Gen. xix. 8, 25, xxvi. 3, 4, Lev. xviii. 27*; the nominal suffix ־הוּ for ־ו, Deut. xiv. 15, like Gen. i. 12, 21, 25*, vi. 20*, vii. 14*, Lev. xi. 16, 22, 29*; אִשָּׁה, Deut. xviii. 1, as often in Ex., Lev., Num.*; מִן, Deut. xiv. 13 ff., like Gen. i. 11, 12, and often; כִּלְאָיִם, Deut. xxii. 9, like Lev. xix. 19*; the original form כֶּשֶׂב instead of כֶּבֶשׂ, Deut. xiv. 4, like Gen. xxx. 32, 33, 35, 40, Lev. i. 10*, iii. 7*, and often.

(5) For instance, גְּבוֹר, Deut. x. 17, and Gen. vi. 4, x. 8, 9 (never again in the Pentateuch): גּוֹזָל, Deut. xxxii. 11, and Gen. xv. 9: זָכוּר, "male," only Deut. xvi. 16, xx. 13, and Ex. xxiii. 17, xxxiv. 23; also זָכָר אוֹ נְקֵבָה, Deut. iv. 16, as to which see § 27, Note 13 at the beginning: חֹדֶשׁ הָאָבִיב, Deut. xvi. 1, like Ex. xiii. 4, xxiii. 15, xxxiv. 18: הֵיטִיב, Deut. xi. 6, like Gen. vii. 4, 23: סְנֵה, Deut. xxxiii. 16, like Ex. iii. 2–4: שְׁגַר, Deut. vii. 13, xxviii. 4, 18, 51, like Ex. xiii. 12: and others still.

§ 31. *The Historical Point of View of the Laws in Deuteronomy.*

The addresses in Deuteronomy, with the laws (which they partly repeat and press more than formerly upon the hearts of the people, and partly give either as wholly new or as appended to earlier ones), were pronounced by Moses in the eleventh month of the fortieth year of the exodus, beyond Jordan in the land of Moab, after the two Amorite kings, Sihon of Heshbon and Og of Bashan, had been conquered (ch. i. 1–5, iv. 44–49); that is, at the time when Israel stood on the border of the promised land, and was preparing to cross the Jordan and take possession of Canaan. This point of view is repeatedly intimated in almost all the laws by the words, "When Jehovah thy God shall bring thee into the land which He sware unto your fathers to give unto them," or "whither thou goest to possess it," or similar formulas (vii. 1, viii. 1, 7, ix. 1, xi. 8 ff., 21, 29, 31, xii. 1, 29, xiii. 12 [ver. 13 Heb.], xvi. 18, xvii. 2, 14, xviii. 9, xix. 1, xxi. 1, xxvi. 1, xxvii. 2, 3). In spite of these constantly returning words, it is alleged that the addresses presuppose a residence of the Israelites in Canaan for a considerable time; and that, although the laws in Deuteronomy keep firm hold of the essential features of the old legislation, yet they exhibit an advance beyond its limits, and important

changes and remodellings of earlier laws and institutions; nay more, they also present indications of an age already estranged from the views prevailing in an earlier antiquity, and presuppose many relations which belong to a later time. Consequently the appearance of Moses as the speaker and lawgiver is said to be "a freedom of a fictitious composition, and not the account of an actual fact" (1). In truth, however, the occupation of the land of Canaan is nowhere supposed to have already taken place (2); it is everywhere represented as still in the future. And as for the laws, partly in the many new regulations which concern the future residence of the people in Canaan, partly in the modification of individual earlier appointments, there does appear an amplification and partially a development of the legislation at Sinai; but there is absolutely no such progress as would lead us further down than the age of Moses, or bring us to perceive views and relations that mark a tolerably late period. Both the laws about the kingly and the priestly offices, about the one place of worship, the sacred feasts (3), and the incomes of the priests and Levites (4), and those about military and judicial procedure (5), are perfectly comprehensible as belonging to the age of Moses in the form in which they are given; and to some extent they are actually in contradiction to the relations of later times. Nor is there anything whatever, in the account given in Deuteronomy of the position of the Levites, to lead to the opinion that circumstances had actually already occurred which mark a later age, subsequent to that of Moses (6). The assertion that this character belongs to its legislation rests merely on the refusal to acknowledge its prophetic character.

(1) So *De Wette*, Einl. § 156, *b*; *Ewald*, Geschichte, i. p. 156 ff.; *v. Lengerke*, p. cxvii. ff.; *Riehm*, § 2 ff., 19, and others. On the other hand, comp. *Ranke*, ii. p. 352 ff.; *Häv.* i. 2, § 133.

(2) *Riehm*, p. 80, introduces this supposition into the following passages:—In Deut. ii. 12, that the Edomites had destroyed the Horites, "and dwelt in their stead, as Israel did unto *the land of his possession*, which Jehovah gave unto them;" where, however, "the land of his possession" is not the land of Canaan in the strict sense, but the district east of Jordan which had already been occupied under Moses, to which this very appellation is given in ch. iii. 20. In the command, ch. xix. 14, "Thou shalt not remove thy neighbour's landmark which they of old time (רִאשֹׁנִים) have set in thine inherit-

ance," because he understands Moses and Joshua by this noun, [an explanation which would make the writer such a fool as to contradict himself in express terms, when he completes the sentence thus, "which thou *shalt* inherit in the land that the Lord thy God *giveth* thee to possess it"]. In the formula, "the stranger (that is, the Levite) that is within thy gates," ch. v. 14; and often, as already in Ex. xx. 10. In the words, ch. iv. 38, "to give thee their land for an inheritance, as this day," by arbitrarily supplying words, "as it is this day." [Very different in cogency are the incidental marks of its really belonging to those last days of Moses, which are noticed by *J. H. Arnold*, p. 103 ff.: its strong traces of familiarity with Egypt; its view of Egypt as the place of evils, especially sicknesses, well known but now left behind, ch. vii. 15, xxviii. 60; the threat of their being carried back into Egypt as captives, ch. xxviii. 68, contrasted with the return into Egypt, which is forbidden, ch. xvii. 16; the mention of "the mountain of the Amorites," ch. i. 7, 19, 20, just as in Josh. xi. 16, 21, "the mountains of Judah," and "the mountains of Israel;" the manner of the geographical statement, ch. iii. 16, "And I gave unto the Reubenites and unto the Gadites, I gave from Gilead even unto the river Arnon, half the valley, and the border, even unto the river Jabbok, which is the border of the children of Ammon," where the territory is marked out on either side from Mount Gilead, as the centre at or near which the speaker stands, with which the following verse well agrees. Also p. 102, the reason assigned for not driving out the Canaanites all at once, ch. vii. 22, "lest the beasts of the field increase upon thee," just as Ex. xxiii. 29, for which a new reason is seen to arise in Judg. ii. 3; the strict commands to root out the Canaanites, while not a word is said against later enemies of Israel, such as Edom, Moab, and Ammon, nay, the Edomites and the Egyptians to be admitted to the congregation of Jehovah in the third generation, ch. xxiii. 3, 4, with which contrast the language of the prophets from Obadiah to Malachi; the directions and warnings in ch. vi.–ix. against worldliness, in consequence of their possessing the land, and enjoying the fulness of its blessings, against a mistaken toleration of the doomed nations, and against vain pride in their riches and their victories,—all which would have been cruel irony in a writer of the times of Manasseh or Josiah, and much of it would have been the same even at a considerably earlier period. And pp. 108–9, the greater minuteness of the laws about food as to mammalia, now that the people were on the point of entering the land of promise; whereas the locusts are passed over in silence when the wilderness is about to be quitted.]

(3) The *law of the kingdom*, ch. xvii. 14–20, is said to be later than Solomon's time, because the prohibitions to the future king (not to multiply horses, not to heap up silver and gold) show that the author had already before him the sad experience which was the consequence of Solomon's wealth (*Riehm*, p. 81 ff.). But it is precisely the motive assigned for his not multiplying horses, not to "cause the people to return to Egypt," which decides against the origination of this law in or after the times of Solomon, and is conceivable only as in the mouth of Moses, who had himself been in Egypt along with the people, and had learned by experience how they lusted after its flesh-pots (Num. xi. 4, 5; comp. xiv. 4 [and Ex. xiii. 17]). But in the times of Solomon and the kings, a return of the people into Egypt was no longer to be thought of; so that *v. Lengerke* (p. cxix.) transforms the meaning of this into a prohibition of "commercial intercourse" with Egypt. Comp. *Hengstb.* iii. p. 247 ff.; and in reference to *Riehm's* objections in reply, *Häv.* i. 2, pp. 473–4. [*J. H. Arnold*, p. 110, says the terms of the law do not contemplate anything so bad as Solomon's taking many *strange* women; and its direction not to choose a stranger for their king would have had no meaning or motive after the throne had been secured for the line of David. Again, p. 159, he observes that since the nations around had kings, unless Moses had fixed the law of the kingdom when it came to be set up in Israel, it would have resembled one of these Oriental tyrannies.] But it appears quite inconceivable how *Riehm* can find the existence of the kingdom probably presupposed in ch. xxviii. 36, "Jehovah will bring thee, and the king which thou *shalt set* over thee, unto a nation which neither thou nor thy fathers have known;" as if Moses could have had actually no presentiment of the coming development of Israel. *Riehm* (pp. 60, 61) does not know how to find any other token of the later origination of the *law of the prophetic office* than this; that on the one hand its real nature is consciously far developed, and that on the other hand it appears already degenerated in many individuals (ch. xviii. 9–22, xiii. 2–6). But in none of these texts is there a trace of this degeneracy as if already appearing, or of an insight into its nature that is far developed. There is only an announcement of the mission of true prophets and of the appearance of false ones, with an account of the tokens of both; and surely Moses could quite well foretell this, unless we deny to him any supernatural glance into futurity.—Also in the *law as to the one place of worship*, which enjoins the extirpation of the seats of idol-worship, of the altars, and of the images, and the presentation of burnt-offerings and sacrifices, of tithes, heave-offerings, and vows,

only *in the place which Jehovah shall choose to put His name there* (ch. xii.). *Stähelin* himself, p. 79, cannot find the existence of the temple at Jerusalem presupposed, saying that "the choice of this formula to designate it would be singular." *Riehm*, p. 28, thinks indeed that this formula must indicate a single *settled* place, since we could not say of the changing abode of the tabernacle that He had "placed" His name, or "caused it to dwell" there; but the assertion is convicted of error and refuted by Jer. vii. 12, "my place which was in Shiloh, where I set (שִׁכַּנְתִּי) my name."—Equally erroneous is his assertion, p. 75, compared with p. 50 ff., that in *the law of the sacred feasts*, ch. xvi. 1–17, particularly that of the passover, there is visible an advance beyond the old legislation: it is indeed inculcated that the passover should be killed only in the place which Jehovah should choose, and not indiscriminately in their cities, vers. 5, 6; but the same thing is already contained in Ex. xxxiv. 18, compared with ver. 24; and the notion, p. 52, that we are to understand ver. 2, "Thou shalt therefore sacrifice the passover unto Jehovah thy God, of the flock and the herd," of *feastings on the firstlings* usual at the feast of unleavened bread, is a fancy entirely without foundation, which therefore does not need to be refuted.

(4) The assertion which has been repeated by *Riehm*, p. 41, that the sacrificial dues of the priests were *probably* not the same as formerly, rests upon Deut. xviii. 3. This text, however, does not treat of sacrificial dues and thank-offerings, but of animals slaughtered for private use [yet, in his commentary, *Keil* thinks it is probably only of such as were slaughtered on solemn occasions, since the verb used is זָבַח], of which the priests were to receive the shoulder, the two cheeks, and the maw, as an indemnity for the loss which their incomes had sustained by the abrogation of the previous law that animals must be slaughtered only at the sanctuary, Lev. xvii. and Deut xii. 15. Comp. *Ranke*, ii. p. 293 ff.; *Häv.* pp. 427–8. The assertion that the tithes of cattle seem to have fallen into disuse by the time that Deuteronomy was written (*Riehm*, pp. 43–4), rests merely upon the circumstance that they are not mentioned; as if all earlier laws must be mentioned in Deuteronomy. And the other assertion, that the Levites no longer had the tithes, nor the priests all the flesh of the firstlings, but that the tithes and the firstlings were applied to sacrificial feasts at which the Levites were merely invited guests (*Riehm*, p. 44 ff.), rests, in the first part of it, upon a denial of the second tithe which is enjoined in Deut. xiv. 22 ff., xxvi. 12 ff. [and does not agree with what is said of the Levites, ch. x. 9, xviii. 2, "Jehovah is their inheritance, as He hath said unto them," namely

at Num. xviii. 20, when He assigned the tithes for their support, on the withdrawal of which this title of His would have been a mockery of *them*]; and otherwise it rests upon the erroneous supposition that the earlier laws had destined the whole flesh of the firstlings for the priests, whereas according to Num. xviii. 17, 18 they obtained only the wave-breast and the right leg: comp. *Hengstb.* p. 406 ff.; *Winer*, Real-Wörterbuch, i. 342; and against *Riehm's* objections in reply to this, *Häv.* p. 428 ff. [In his comment. on Deut. xii., *Keil* states this a little differently: that the firstlings were given to the priests to be used by them in sacrificial feasts, to which the persons who had brought these animals would themselves naturally be invited.]

(5) In the laws as to war (ch. xx., xxiv. 5), the very humane and philanthropic procedure which is enjoined (*Riehm*, pp. 65–6) cannot be urged against the Mosaic origin: as, for instance, the prohibition of injury to the fruit-trees, with the motive, "for thou mayest eat of them" (ch. xx. 19), was of value only in the wars at the conquest of the land of Canaan, not in later external wars. In the regulations about judicial proceedings, the appointment of *elders* presiding in the several cities (ch. xix. 12, xxi. 2, 3, 6, 19, xxii. 15, 16, 18, xxv. 7–9), who in their magisterial capacity represent the cities, and who have to give a judicial decision in all family matters; and of *judges* as well as certain subordinate *officers* of justice (שֹׁטְרִים) for the administration of justice in all other private cases and in criminal cases, while more difficult cases were to be brought before Jehovah, before the priests and the judges (ch. xvii. 8 ff., xix. 17); —in all this, according to *Riehm* (p. 61 ff.), there are the plainest indications of a period which has advanced far beyond the relations of the Mosaic legislation. But how it should be so, is as far beyond our comprehension as is his discovery (pp. 86–7; compare against him *Häv.* p. 470) of the supreme tribunal established in Jerusalem by king Jehoshaphat (2 Chron. xix. 8–11), in the words, "Then shalt thou arise, and get thee up into the place which the Lord thy God *shall choose*; and thou shalt come unto the priests the Levites, and unto *the judge that shall be in those days*" (ch. xvii. 8–9).—No better, partly still worse, are his proofs of the remaining traces of relations later than those of the time of Moses; among which he actually identifies (pp. 66–7) the wife suspected of adultery (Num. v. 11 ff.) with the virgin charged with unchastity (Deut. xxii. 13 ff.), on which to found the statement that the Deuteronomist substituted a judicial investigation for a divine decision, because this latter had ceased to be credited in his day! See the particulars in *Häv.* § 131 and 133.

(6) The assertion of *De Wette*, that Deuteronomy assumes the

existence of a priestly race without a settled home and maintenance, or that of *Riehm* (p. 31 ff.), that the Levites no longer lived in the cities assigned to them in Num. xxxv., but were scattered as strangers or sojourners in the several cities of the other tribes, and were reckoned among the indigent classes who required assistance, [an opinion substantially held by *Bleek*, p. 294, who thinks that they still generally dwelt in their cities during the reign of David, according to 1 Chron. xiii. 2, and that the change was connected with the division of the people into two kingdoms], rests upon a twofold error. The *first* is the erroneous assumption that, so long as their peculiar cities were assigned to the Levites, they did not dwell with Israel within their gates or cities. Now, not to speak of the arbitrary interpretation of the expression "the Levite that is within thy gates," by interpolating the words "as a stranger," in *Riehm*, p. 33, against which comp. *Häv.* p. 427, two things are overlooked here: A. The Levites were not the only occupants of the cities assigned to them; they were to receive in them only the necessary number of houses, with fields for pasturing their cattle, while the rest of the houses in these cities, and their fields, were possessed by the Israelites of the several tribes: comp. *Keil*, Comm. über das Buch Jos. pp. 272 and 366–7; *Ewald*, Geschichte, ii. p. 306. B. As Moses foresaw, Ex. xxiii. 29, 30, when possession was taken of the land, the Canaanites were not immediately destroyed or driven out, and consequently all the cities and territory did not actually pass into the possession of those to whom these fell at the partition of the country, or did not remain with them; hence also in many localities the Levites must have been compelled to seek for houses in some other place, and to dwell in the gates of their brethren, or to dwell in other than Levitical cities. The *second* error consists in the assumption that Deuteronomy explains the only source of maintenance for the Levites as being the share in the sacrificial feasts of the tithes, which it assigns to the Levites; whereas the tithe of the Levitical tithes, which the priests received from the people (Num. xviii.), is assumed in Deuteronomy to be arranged by the earlier law [see above, the addition in Note 4], and to be acknowledged: though Moses certainly would foresee that this tithe, the punctual and faithful payment of which was left to every man's individual conscience, would not flow in always so liberally, owing to the strong idolatrous tendencies of the people, as to suffice for the ever increasing Levitical families.—Also Deuteronomy is alleged to obscure the sharp distinction between the priests and the Levites, and to make the latter competent for more duties and to attribute to them higher consideration than before (*De Wette*, *Riehm*, p. 34 ff.). This,

however, does not follow, either from the designation הַכֹּהֲנִים הַלְוִיִּם, *the Levitical priests* (that is, the priests from among the sons of Levi, and not *the priestly Levites*, as *v. Lengerke* translates by doing violence to the language), [to which, and the kindred expression *the priests the sons of Levi*, weight is also attached by *Bleek*, p. 295]; or from Deut. xviii. 6–8, where the service of the Levites is alleged to be designated by the same words as that of the priests elsewhere, since a difference exists between שָׁרַת אֶת־יְהוָה and שָׁרַת לִפְנֵי יְהוָה. Only the former expression designates the specific priestly office (ch. xvii. 12, xxi. 5; comp. 1 Sam. ii. 11, iii. 1); the latter, on the contrary, is used in a wider sense, not only of the priestly service, but also of that rendered by the prophets, 1 Kings xvii. 1, xviii. 15, and often. Comp. *Häv.* pp. 431–2. [*Vaihinger* finds fault with this statement, art. Pentateuch, pp. 319, 322; but the blunder seems to be his own. The most plausible passage for confounding priests and Levites is perhaps ch. x. 8, "At that time the Lord separated the tribe of Levi to bear the ark of the covenant of the Lord, to stand before the Lord to minister unto Him, and to bless in His name unto this day." Yet we suppose it is conceded by every one that this cannot mean that, in the opinion of the writer of Deuteronomy, all the Levites exercised these functions from the beginning; in other words, that from the time when Jehovah separated the tribe of Levi, there never was a distinction between the priests and the common Levites. If so, it only remains to say that this is affirmed, according to the technical language of the old logicians, in a divided and not in a compounded sense; not that each individual Levite was separated to do all these things, but that all who were separated to do them were Levites. Then the idea that Deuteronomy obscures the distinction of the two orders can be true, not in the sense which is hostile to the belief that Moses wrote it, but only in the sense that the popular and rhetorical character of this book did not call for the discrimination of the two orders. This will surprise no one who considers how much they were alike; so that the Levites were the companions and assistants of the priests, competent to do everything at their bidding which they could do, except ministering at the altar; and let it be noted how the distinction remains in entire abeyance, for instance, in the argument in Heb. vii., though the writer will be acknowledged to be familiar with the sharp line of demarcation between them. See some good remarks in *Oehler's* article Levi, in *Herzog's* Encyc. viii. pp. 350, 351, 357.]

§ 32. *Unity of the Pentateuch.*

I. In reference to the *matter*.—That the Pentateuch in its present shape proceeds from a single author, is proved by its aim and plan; according to which its whole contents refer to the covenant concluded between Jehovah and His people by the instrumentality of Moses, in such a way that everything before his time is perceived to be preparatory to this fact, and all the rest to be the development of it (§ 22). Nevertheless this unity has not been first stamped upon it as a matter of necessity by the latest Redactor: it has been there from the beginning, and is visible in the first plan and the whole execution of the work. This is clearly seen, indeed, from the exact chronology which runs through all the five books, and knits all their parts together (1); yet more from the care with which the materials are organically connected, and the individual elements are linked together internally, so that the earlier sections point forward to those by which they are succeeded, and for which they prepare the way (2); while the later sections point back to those which preceded, partly developing them, partly explaining and supplementing them (3).

(1) The chronological thread begins with the creation, to which the genealogical series in Gen. v. (where the chronological data from Adam to Moses are furnished to us in the years of the patriarchs' lives) is attached in vers. 1, 2. The accounts in ch. vii. 6, 11 connect this first genealogy with the second in xi. 10–26, which continues the chronology on till the time of Abraham's birth. There are linked on to this the further accounts, ch. xii. 4, xvi. 16, xvii. 1. xxi. 5 (Isaac's birth), xxiii. 1, xxv. 7, 20, 26 (Jacob's birth), xxxv. 28, xxxvii. 2, xli. 46, and xlv. 6, till the time of Israel's migration into Egypt, ch. xlvii. 9. After these events, Ex. xii. 40 reckons up the duration of their stay in Egypt, and at the same time carefully gives the month and the day of their exodus out of this land (vers. 2, 6, 18, 29, 41), because this day constitutes the commencement of the era according to which all subsequent events of chief importance are determined. Such are Ex. xvi. 1, xix. 1 (arrival at Sinai and commencement of the legislation), xl. 17 (erection of the tabernacle), Num. i. 1, 18 (the census), x. 11 (departure from Sinai), x. 33, xx. 1, xxxiii. 38, Deut. i. 3 (last addresses of Moses on the border of the promised land).

Comp., besides, Deut. xxxi. 2 with Ex. vii. 7. This will be found made good in greater detail by *Ranke*, i. p. 36 ff.

(2) One may choose to look away from the prophecies which foretell coming events and point forwards, for the reason that these are a proof of the unity of the historical development, rather than of the unity of the plan and composition of the document. But in this case the unity of the plan and execution are manifested especially in passages which form the scaffolding and framework of the whole document, and refer, partly negatively and partly positively, to subsequent accounts and occurrences. To this class belong, in particular, the following texts, those found in the so-called fundamental document being marked with an asterisk:—Gen. v. 32*, where the absence of any mention of the years of Noah's life after begetting his sons, points forward to ch. vii. 6 and ix. 28, 29*. Gen. x. 21, where Shem is named "the father of all the children of Eber," in preparation for the history of the children of Eber, beginning with ch. xi. 14*. The absence of all mention of the sons of Peleg, ch. x. 25, refers us to the later, more copious, and complete statement of the Shemitic races, ch. xi. 18 ff.* The detailed account of Terah's posterity, ch. xi. 27–30*, is "a well-pondered preparation for the following histories; for which not only Abram and Sarai, but also Lot, Milcah, and Iscah, are of importance" (*Ranke*, i. p. 17). The accounts of the relationship of Nahor and Milcah prepare for ch. xxii. 20 ff.* and ch. xxiv.; Lot is mentioned, not only on account of ch. xii. 5*, but principally with reference to ch. xiii. 5 ff. and ch. xix.; the barrenness of Sarai has reference to ch. xv., xvi. ff. In ch. xxii. 23* the ancestry of Rebecca is given, with reference to ch. xxiv. Further, Ex. iii. 11, 12 points forward to ch. xix. ff., and ch. iii. 19–22 to ch. vii. 26–xi. 10, xii. 29–36. The genealogy of Moses and Aaron, Ex. vi. 14 ff.*, contains references to the following books (comp. *Ranke*, i. p. 71 ff.); that of the sons of Levi (ver. 16 ff.) refers to Ex. xxviii. 1* and Lev. viii.–x.; the account of the sons of Korah (ver. 24) to Num. xvi. xvii. (*Ranke*, p. 74); that of the sons of Uzziel (ver. 22) to Lev. x. 4, 5; that of the wife of Eleazar, who bore Phinehas to him (ver. 25), to Num. xx. 22–29 and xxv. 11–13 (*Ranke*, p. 75). Ex. xx. 24 and xxiii. 14–17, 19, point forward to Ex. xxv., xxxi., and xxxv.–xl. The brief regulations about the feasts of harvest and ingathering, Ex. xxiii. 16 and xxxiv. 21–23, imply the more precise regulations which follow later, Lev. xxiii. 10–22, 33–43, and xxv. Ex. xxi. 13 promises places of refuge, or free cities, in Canaan: and these are first appointed in Num. xxxv. 9–15. Lev. v. 2, 3 refers to ordinances as to things clean and unclean, which do not follow till

ch. xi.–xv. Lev. xxv. 32 requires the appointment of the Levitical cities, which does not follow till Num. xxxv. 1–8. Num. i. 19, the census "in the wilderness of Sinai," makes a reference to the later census "in the plains of Moab," ch. xxvi. 63. Num. xxv. 17 is preparatory to ch. xxxi.; so is ch. xxvi. 33, which mentions the daughters of Zelophehad, to the succeeding accounts and laws in ch. xxvii. and xxxvi.

(3) The cases of reference to matter which preceded are peculiarly numerous. Besides those already adduced in § 24, Note 2, in which the so-called fundamental document refers to earlier sections of the supplementer, the following may be regarded as the principal instances:—Gen. iv. 25 ("again") referring to ver. 1; ch. vii. 22 to ch. ii. 7; ch. xiii. 10 ("as the garden of the Lord") to ch. ii. 8 ff.; ch. xv. 7 to ch. xii. 1 ff.; ch. xvi. 10 to ch. xv. 5 and xiii. 16; ch. xviii. and xix. to ch. xvii. (*Kurtz*, Einh. p. 96); ch. xxi. 4 to ch. xvii. 10 ff.; ch. xxii. 19 to ch. xxi. 33; ch. xxiv. 1–4 to ch. xii. 1 ff.; ch. xxiv. 62 and xxv. 11 to ch. xvi. 14; ch. xxv. 9–11 to ch. xxiii.; ch. xxvi. 1 to ch. xii. 10; ch. xxvii. 36 to ch. xxv. 30 ff.; ch. xxviii. 3, 4, to ch. xvii. 1–8; ch. xxviii. 5 to ch. xxv. 20; ch. xxxi. 13 to ch. xxviii. 18–22; ch. xxxiv. 7 ("in Israel") to ch. xxxii. 29; ch. xxxv. 1, 3, 7, to ch. xxviii. 10 ff. and xxvii. 41–45; ch. xxxv. 2, 4 (the strange gods) to ch. xxxi. 19, 30–36; ch. xlvi. 12 to ch. xxxviii. 6–10; ch. xlii. 9 to ch. xxxvii. 5–10; ch. xlvi. 20 to ch. xli. 50–52; ch. xlviii. 7 to ch. xxxv. 19; ch. xlix. 4 to ch. xxxv. 22; ch. xlix. 5, 6, to ch. xxxiv. 25 ff.

Further, Ex. ii. 24 refers back to Gen. xv., xvii., xxvi. 3 ff., xxviii. 13 ff., xxxv. 11, 12, and xlvi. 3, 4; Ex. iii. 7 and 16 to ch. i. 14 ff. and ii. 23, 24; Ex. iv. 24 ff. to Gen. xvii. 10 ff.; Ex. vi. 5 to ch. ii. 24; Ex. xii. 31 ff. to ch. vi. 1; Ex. xx. 11 (the Sabbath) to Gen. ii. 2, 3; Ex. xxiii. 15 to ch. xii. 2 ff.; Ex. xxxii. 1 to ch. xxiv. 14 and 18.

Then Lev. i. 3 refers back to Ex. xl. 17–33; Lev. viii. 4, 9, 13, 17, 21, 29, 34–36, to the regulations in Ex. xxviii. xxix. (compare also Lev. viii. 6–9 with Ex. xxix. 4–6; Lev. viii. 10, 11, with Ex. xxx. 26–29, and xl. 9–11; Lev. viii. 12–17 with Ex. xxix. 7–14, etc.); Lev. ix. 23, 24, in fulfilment of Ex. ix. 43, 44, and Lev. ix. 4, 6; Lev. x. 16–20 refers to ch. vi. 19–22 and vii. 6, 7; ch. xvi. 1 to ch. x. 1, 2; ch. xvi. 16 to Ex. xxx. 10. The laws as to the conditions required in the priests and in the animals for sacrifice, Lev. xxi.–xxii. 30, presuppose the general law of offerings in ch. i.–vii.; the brief notices of the Sabbath, the passover, and the day of atonement, Lev. xxiii. 3–8, 27 ff., compared with the copious regulations for the feasts

of harvest and of tabernacles (vers. 9–22 and 33–43), presuppose the laws which had been already given, Ex. xx. 8–11, xii. 3–20, 43–50, and Lev. xvi.

Once more, Num. i. 1 refers back to Ex. xl. 17 and xix. 1; Num. iii. 4 to Lev. x. 1, 8 [? ver. 12]; Num. vii. 89 is the fulfilment of Ex. xxv. 22; Num. x. 13–28 is the continuation of ch. ii.; ch. xiv. 11, 13, 22, refer to the miracles in Egypt, Ex. v.–xiv.,—the words in ver. 22, "those men have tempted me now these *ten* times," having reference to the events in Ex. v. 20, 21, xiv. 11, 12, xv. 22–27, xvi. 2, 3, 20, xvii. 1–7, xxxii., Num. xi. 1–3, 4–34, and ch. xiv. (comp. *Ranke*, p. 121); ch. xiv. 17, 18, refers back to Ex. xxxiv. 6; ch. xiv. 29 to ch. i.; ch. xv. 1–16 presupposes the law of offerings in Lev. i.–viii., and that of the feasts in Lev. xxiii. (comp. *Ranke*, pp. 122–3); ch. xv. 22–31 refers back to Lev. iv., at the same time supplementing the laws there; ch. xvi. assumes the existence of the laws in Ex. xxviii. 35, 43, xxx. 21, Lev. xvi. 2, Num. i. 51, iii. 10, iv. 15, 17–20, viii. 19, and xv. 30, 31 (*Ranke*, p. 127); Num. xvi. 9–11 refers to Lev. xxii. 10–16 [?]; Num. xviii. 15 to Ex. xiii. 1, 2, 11–16; Num. xviii. 18 to Lev. vii. 31–33; Num. xviii. 20–24 to Lev. xxv. 32–34 and xxvii. 30–33; Num. xx. 24 to xx. 12; Num. xxiii. 10 to Gen. xiii. 16 and xxviii. 14; Num. xxiii. 24 and xxiv. 9 to Gen. xlix. 9; Num. xxiv. 9 to Gen. xxvii. 29 and xii. 3 (comp. also Num. xxiv. 20 with Ex. xvii. 14, Num. xxiv. 18 with Gen. xxvii. 29, 40); Num. xxvi. 4, 63, 64, to i. 2 ff., and the notices of the genealogies there to Gen. xlvi. (comp. *Ranke*, pp. 138–9); Num. xxvi. 8–11 to Num. xvi. 31 ff.; Num. xxvi. 19 to Gen. xlvi. 12 and xxxviii. 6–10; Num. xxvi. 60, 61, to Lev. x. 1, 2; Num. xxvi. 62 to ch. xviii. 20–24; Num. xxvii. 3 to ch. xvi.; ch. xxvii. 13, 14, to ch. xx. 12, 24; ch. xxviii. 3–8 to Ex. xxix. 38–42; ch. xxviii. 16–25 to Ex. xii., xxiii. 14, and Lev. xxiii. 8; Num. xxviii. 26–30 to Lev. xxiii. 15–20; Num. xxix. 1–6 to Lev. xxiii. 24, 25; Num. xxix. 7–11 to Lev. xvi. and xxiii. 27–32; Num. xxix. 13–38 to Lev. xxiii. 36; Num. xxxi. 2 to xxvii. 13; ch. xxxi. 6 to x. 9; ch. xxxi. 16 to xxv. 1 ff.; ch. xxxi. 19, 20, and 23, to xix. 11–22; ch. xxxi. 49, 50, to Ex. xxx. 11–16; Num. xxxii. 8–13 to ch. xiv.; ch. xxxii. 28 (by naming Joshua along with Eleazar) presupposes ch. xxvii. 16–23; ch. xxxiii. 38 refers back to xx. 27, 28; ch. xxxiii. 40 to xxi. 1–3; ch. xxxvi. to ch. xxvii. 1–11; ch. xxxiii. 54 and xxxvi. 2 to xxvi. 52–56; ch. xxxvi. 4 to Lev. xxv. 8 ff.

Finally, for the references in Deuteronomy to the earlier books, compare § 29. Attention deserves also to be given to the constantly recurring practice of giving the mother's name in the case of theocra-

tically important persons; not only the patriarchs (Gen. xi. 29, xxv. 20, xxix. 16 ff.) and Ishmael (Gen. xvi. 15, xxv. 12), but also Moses and Aaron (Ex. vi. 20; Num. xxvi. 59), and Eleazar (Ex. vi. 25).

Moreover, the three intermediate books were not composed piecemeal and contemporaneously with the events, as journals are, but at once, after the last addresses of Moses, according to the plan developed above; or at least they were finally adjusted and edited in this manner (4).

(4) This follows at once from those points of essential moment adduced in Note 2, yet more distinctly from the accounts in Ex. xvi. 35, of God feeding Israel for forty years with manna, till they came to the borders of the land of Canaan; in Ex. xxxiv. 33–35, of the permanence of the glory of Moses' countenance; and in Ex. xl. 38, of the cloud guiding Israel in all their marches, and giving the signal for moving and for pitching, as it lifted itself up or settled down.

II. In reference to the *language*.—The language also continues the same in all its characteristic peculiarities, throughout the whole of the books and sections of the entire work. No one has been able to prove a twofold *usus loquendi* in the first four books, or one in Deuteronomy diverging from that in the previous books, such as would be fatal to the unity of composition of the whole work (5).

(5) Compare § 27 and § 30. To the numerous words and phrases adduced there already, which evince the identity of the *usus loquendi*, there fall still to be added the antique forms and words: הַלְלָה; the union vowels ִי and ֹו used with the construct state; the absence of ת in the infinitives of verbs ה״ל; the words אַלּוּף, עַל־אֹדוֹת, אָסוֹן, נִבְנֶה (to have a family), נָחוֹן, יָשֵׂם for שׂוּם, מִכְסֶה, לֹן and תְּלוּנָה, עֲרוּמִי, עֲרוּמֹת מוֹאָב, רָחַף, רִכֵּשׁ, שָׂרִיג and שֶׂרֶץ, which occur repeatedly in both "the fundamental document" and "the supplementer." See the pasages in § 15 and § 27.—As for the assertion of *Tuch* (Genesis, pp. lxxxii. lxxxiii.), *De Wette* (Einl. § 157, *b*), *Hupfeld*, p. 198, and others, that the supplementer or editor produced this agreement by intentionally copying the fundamental document, it is an arbitrary dictum by which to set aside a fact that is troublesome to the hypothesis which they have adopted. Comp. against it, *Kurtz*, Einheit d. Gen. p. xlii. note; and *Häv.* i. 2, p. 189.

This peculiarity in the *usus loquendi* is not only decisive in favour

of the unity and independence of the Pentateuch, as well as against the hypothesis that the book of Joshua originally formed part of the same work (a hypothesis, indeed, which is wrecked upon the fivefold division of the law (6)), since the archaisms of the Pentateuch are wholly wanting in Joshua: aided by the consideration of the obvious unity of all the sections of the Pentateuch, as manifested in their closely connected subject-matter, it also refutes the opinion that two currents are perceptible in the work, one prophetical and one priestly-juridical, which indicate the combined authorship of a priestly Elohist and a prophetical Jehovist (7).

(6) Comp. § 20, and *Delitzsch*, Gen. i. p. 18: "The Book of the Law was likewise originally a whole consisting of five parts, a Pentateuch (חוּמָשׁ). It is not laid out in such a way as to form a Hexateuch along with the book of Joshua." See more below, § 42.

(7) Against this hypothesis, set up by *Delitzsch*, i. p. 37, and received with approval by *Kurtz*, Gesch. d. Alten Bund. ii. p. 541, comp. *Häv.* Einl. i. 2, § 119, where it is shown that it is ruined by Ex. xxi.–xxiii., without going any further.

§ 33. *The Author of the Pentateuch.*

Without looking to Ex. xvii. 14, xxiv. 3, 4, Num. xxxiii. 2, because they give no direct testimony as to the Pentateuch (1), in Deut. xxxi. 9–11, 24–26, compared with xvii. 18, 19, xxviii. 58, 61, xxix. 19, 20, 26, xxx. 10, the composition of the entire "Law" is so decidedly attributed to Moses (2), that all attempts to set aside this testimony must fail (3).

(1) In Ex. xvii. 14, after the victory over the Amalekites, Moses receives the divine command to write in *the* book (בַּסֵּפֶר, that is, one destined for the record of the deeds of the Lord in Israel), for a memorial, the will of God that Amalek should be utterly blotted out. According to Ex. xxiv. 3, 4, Moses wrote the words of the covenant and the "rights" of Israel (Ex. xx. 2–17, xxi.–xxiii.) in "the Book of the Covenant," and then read them before all the people [ver. 7]. Comp. *Hengstb.* Beitrr. iii. p. 150 ff., and ii. pp. 467–8.—According to Num. xxxiii. 2, Moses wrote down the camping stations of the Israelites in the wilderness by the divine command.—*Ewald*, Gesch. i. pp. 163–4, and *v. Lengerke*, pp. xxvii. and cxiv., have understood these notices erroneously, as if they were testimonies to the composi-

tion of the Pentateuch by Moses; and out of them they have formed the contradiction, that in the middle books the composition of only individual portions is attributed to Moses, but in Deuteronomy, on the contrary, that of the whole Pentateuch is so attributed. For these passages treat only of the recording of the Book of the Covenant, as the documentary basis for concluding that covenant; and of individual specially memorable events, which were to be preserved for the future in written form as memorials (Ex. xvii. 14) of manifestations of divine grace: from which, in so far as these things were recorded by the divine command, Moses could infer (but nothing more) the divine intention to transmit to posterity, in written form, all the important proofs of God's covenant faithfulness. Comp. *Häv.* i. 2, p. 15 ff.

(2) According to Deut. xxxi. 9–11, Moses wrote the law, and gave it to the priests, with the command to read it before all Israel, every seven years, at the feast of tabernacles. And (vers. 24–26) "when Moses had made an end of writing the words of the law in a book, until they were finished, Moses commanded the Levites, . . . saying, Take this book of the law, and put it at [more correctly than 'in,' as in the English Bible] the side of the ark of the covenant of the Lord your God, that it may be there for a witness against thee." Now, as ver. 24 is the commencement of an appendix by another hand, whose author distinguishes his work sufficiently from that of Moses by the words, "And it came to pass, when Moses had made an end of writing the words of this law in a book, until they were finished," it follows that Deut. xxxi. delivers a twofold testimony for the composition of the Pentateuch by Moses; namely his own, and that of the author of the appendix, which was probably added by a contemporary not long after his death. To this double testimony we must add Deut. xvii. 18, that the future king who should be chosen was to write "a copy of this law" for himself from that one which was before the priests the Levites, and was to read therein every day; ch. xxvii. 1–8, where Moses commands the people, after crossing Jordan and passing into the land of Canaan, to set up on Mount Ebal great stones overlaid with plaster, and to write upon these all the words of this law, which was actually done, according to Josh. viii. 30–35; and ch. xxviii. 58, 61, xxix. 19, 20, 26, where Moses threatens the Israelites, in case they do not observe to do all the words of *this law*, that are *written in this book*, then Jehovah would appoint extraordinary plagues to punish them, "also every sickness, and every plague, which is not *written in the book of this law*," and "all the *curses that are written in this book*;" and ch. xxx. 10, where he promises

every blessing, if they observe "to keep His commandments and His statutes *which are written in this book of the law.*" In all these passages it is assumed, or sometimes it is testified, not only that the book of the law was extant, but also that it was composed by Moses. For he could not have given such directions, such warnings, and such threatenings, had not a book of the law already existed, which he was about to complete by writing down the addresses which he had finished, and annexing them to this written law already in the hands of the people, to whom he was going to hand over the whole as his last will and testament.

(3) We do not repeat the objections made by older and by more recent opponents, which have been completely set aside by *Hengstb.* iii. p. 154 ff., and *Häv.* § 109. But, last of all, *Delitzsch*, Gen. i. pp. 25–6, and *Kurtz*, Gesch. d. Alten Bund. ii. pp. 533, 538 ff., would refer this testimony that Moses was the author, not to the entire Pentateuch, but solely to Deuteronomy; remarking that it alone is meant in these passages by "this law" and "the book of this law," and that it has been always so understood in Jewish tradition. This latter assertion, however, is entirely incorrect; and the former cannot be proved, inasmuch as the passages mentioned have always been understood by the Jews of the entire law from Gen. i. to Deut. xxxiv., as I have pointed out in *Häv.* Einl. i. 2, p. 21 ff.

Consequently Deuteronomy bears testimony that Moses composed the Pentateuch: and to this testimony we have the less reason to refuse credit, for these two reasons. First, the more recent hypotheses regarding the origination of this work are not calculated to shake our belief; see § 24–31. Secondly, *Delitzsch*, Gen. i. p. 21 ff., has shown excellently, that not only the conditions indispensable for such a work existed in the age of Moses, but also that the law corresponds to the expectations which we might entertain regarding a work by Moses, when we take his individuality into consideration.

From the words in Deut. xxxi. 24, "And it came to pass, when Moses had made an end of writing the words of this law in a book, until they were finished," it follows, nevertheless, that his composition ends at ver. 23, and that the remainder, from ver. 24 onwards, forms an appendix by another hand. This annexes to the work of Moses not only the song which he had already written down (ch. xxxi. 22 compared with ver. 19), and his blessing on the tribes, ch. xxxii. xxxiii., but also the accounts of the completion of the law, and its

solemn delivery to the Levites, ch. xxxi. 24–30, and of the death of Moses, ch. xxxii. 48–52 and xxxiv. (4).

(4) Already the Rabbins acknowledged that ch. xxxiv. had not been written by Moses himself (*Häv.* i. 1, p. 41). *Eichhorn* (i. 1, p. 223) considers ch. xxxi. 24 to be the subscription by the hand of Moses himself at the end of his work, and vers. 25–30 to be the proper conclusion, necessarily added so as to give, by way of supplement to the history, the song of Moses which had been already announced but not yet communicated. However, ver. 24 has not the form of a subscription; much rather it is the connecting link between the appendix and the original work, the conclusion of which is manifestly to be assumed at ver. 23 (comp. *Hengstb.* iii. p. 155). With this assumption ver. 9 does not conflict: for the words, "And Moses wrote this law, and delivered it unto the priests, . . . and commanded them," etc., do not necessitate the supposition that before Moses had fully completed the book, he formally handed the law to the priests, and then took it back for the purpose of adding the conclusion. But his *delivering it* stands in closest connection with his *commanding them* (ver. 10); and it is to be taken in a representative sense, that he gave over the law to those who had the charge of the sanctuary, as his legacy for the future, that they might preserve it for the people, and evermore inculcate it. *Mich. Baumgarten* (Comm. ii. pp. 530–1) finds the conclusion of the law in ch. xxx. 20: however, the address at concluding the covenant, ch. xxix. xxx., forms a very suitable termination to *the legislation*, but not to *the written law*.

But if ch. xxxii.–xxxiv. form an appendix by a different hand, then the laudatory mention made of Moses in ch. xxxiii. 1, xxxiv. 5, 10–12, can be of no value as evidence against the composition of the Pentateuch by Moses (5).

(5) The other passages adduced—Ex. xi. 3, Num. xii. 7, and ver. 3: "Moses was very meek, above all the men which were upon the face of the earth"—contain nothing but remarks indispensable to make the history complete, and to give the motives of the events which are narrated. And they can the less be regarded as idle self-laudation (comp. *Hengstb.* p. 173 ff.; *Häv.* i. 2, pp. 30–1), since Moses narrates his work here, as everywhere, quite objectively, speaking of himself in the third person; as is done by all the sacred historians, and by other great historical characters. This was already remarked by *Clericus*, in answer to those who wished to find in the use of the third

person a token that Moses was not the author. This thoroughly futile argument is refuted copiously by *Hengstb.* p. 167 ff., and *Häv.* p. 28 ff. Comp. also *Welte*, Nachmosaisches, p. 41 ff.

§ 34. *Historical Testimonies to the fact that Moses composed the Pentateuch.*

The testimony which the Pentateuch itself bears to its Mosaic origin is confirmed by all the succeeding writings in the Old Testament (1).

(1) Comp. *Häv.* i. 2, § 136 ff.; *Hengstb.* Beitrr. ii. p. 48 ff., iii. 1 ff. [*Bleek*, on the contrary, pp. 338–9, makes light of this whole subsequent evidence. First, of the *historical* books, he observes that it is difficult to say how much belongs to the actors, and how much to the writers, who may have transferred to earlier periods the matters which belonged to their own much later times; while in *Judges* and *Samuel* there are special difficulties, on account of the many places of worship which they mention, not consistent with the Mosaic law. Secondly, the age of the *Psalms* is very uncertain, and the references to the laws are very general; in particular, there is scarcely a trace of a reference to Deuteronomy. Thirdly, the *prophets* who preceded Jeremiah and Ezekiel do refer to the history and the legislation, but only in a general way; and in spite of what *Hengstenberg* has said, there is not a certain reference to Deuteronomy.]

I. The whole of the *historical portion*, from the book of Joshua down to Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah, in connection with the history of Joshua, the Judges, and the Kings, represents the Pentateuch as being Moses' book of the law. The book of *Jôshua* is not only pervaded thoroughly by references to the Pentateuch (2), but it also repeatedly mentions expressly "the book of the law of Moses" (ch. i. 7, 8, viii. 31, 34, xxiii. 6, xxiv. 26).

(2) It seems superfluous to adduce the great multitude of these references, both in matter and in language, since they are generally acknowledged by our opponents also: so that they actually would make the Pentateuch and Joshua a single work (see at the end of § 32); and merely on account of the acquaintance with the Pentateuch which is manifested in Joshua, thrust down the date of the composition of the latter to the commencement of the exile: comp. § 44, Note 1.

In the book of *Judges* the book of the law of Moses is not indeed expressly quoted. None the less, however, does the author show himself well acquainted with the Pentateuch in its whole extent (3); and more than this, the history which he writes furnishes sufficient evidence that, in spite of all the disorder in the political and religious relations of the theocracy during the whole period of the judges, the law of Moses formed the basis of the religious, civil, and political life of the nation (4).

(3) In opposition to the uncritical statements of a *De Wette* (Beiträge, i. p. 152), a *Bertholdt* (Einl. p. 762), and a *P. v. Bohlen* (Genes. pp. cl. and cxx.), "that the book of Judges does not contain the slightest trace of the Mosaic books," *Bertheau* (Richter, p. xxiii. ff.) already decides, "The first part of the book, ch. i. 1–ii. 5, would be unintelligible throughout, and destitute of any solid foundation, if the Pentateuch and the book of Joshua did not precede it and serve for support to it." "The prophetic address, ch. ii. 1–5, presupposes the command to extirpate the Canaanites, which is emphatically prominent in the Pentateuch and Joshua." "The historical survey, ch. ii. 11–xvi. [23?], is preceded and has the way prepared for it in the Pentateuch and Joshua; comp. especially Ex. xxiii. 20–30, Josh. xxiii. The distinguishing expression, which returns regularly at the commencement of the seven sections, 'They did evil in the sight of Jehovah,' is known to us from Num. xxxii. 13, Deut. iv. 25, ix. 18, xvii. 2." The references, however, are much more striking. The address of the angel of Jehovah, ch. ii. 1 ff., is entirely a compilation from passages in the Pentateuch: ver. 2*ab*, word for word from Ex. xxxiv. 12, 13, Deut. vii. 2, 5, comp. Ex. xxiii. 32, Deut. xii. 3; with ver. 2*c* comp. Ex. xxiii. 21; ver. 3*a* is (לְצָרִים) from Num. xxxiii. 55; ver. 3*b* is from Ex. xxiii. 33, comp. x. 7, Deut. vii. 16.—Ch. ii. 10 reminds us of Ex. i. [6], 8; ver. 15 refers to Lev. xxvi. 15–17, Deut. xxviii. 25; ver. 17*a* is drawn from Ex. xxxiv. 15, and ver. 17*b* from Ex. xxxii. 8.—Ch. iv. 15 leans upon Ex. xiv. 24, from which comes the unusual word וַיָּהֹם.—The address of the prophet, ch. vi. 8, begins immediately with the words of Ex. xx. 2; and at ver. 16 the great promise to Moses is repeated to Gideon, "Certainly I will be with thee," Ex. iii. 12; whereupon, at ver. 39, Gideon excuses his boldness with the words of Abraham, Gen. xviii. 32.—In ch. xi. 15 ff., the negotiation of Jephthah with the king of the Ammonites depends entirely upon Num. xx. xxi., compared with Num. v. 14–21 [?]; whereas the hypothesis of *Bertheau* (p. 152),

that in Judg. xi. 12–28 the basis is a historical work upon the relations of the Israelites on the east of Jordan, and their attitude towards the Moabites and Ammonites, which work has also been used in Num. xxi., Deut. ii. and iii., and here and there in Joshua, is founded on the assumption of the non-existence of the Pentateuch in Jephthah's time, and finds no foothold in the fact that a few words of Jephthah do not occur in the Pentateuch.—In ch. xiii. 7 the angel of the Lord promises a son to the wife of Manoah, in the words which the angel of the Lord spoke to Hagar; and there the narrator has retained even the unusual form יַלְדָּה from Gen. xvi. 11.—The outrage of the men of Gibeah, ch. xix. 22 ff., is described in words taken from Gen. xix. 4 ff.—In the address of the Levite, ch. xx. 6, the words, "They have committed lewdness and folly in Israel," are from the Pentateuch; in it alone the term "lewdness" (זִמָּה) occurs, and עָשָׂה נְבָלָה is specially from Gen. xxxiv. 7 and Deut. xxii. 21.—Also the expression מְתֹם [for מְתֹם] עִיר, ch. xx. 48, reminds us of Deut. ii. 34, iii. 6; and in ch. xxi. 17 the elders give a spiritual exposition of Deut. xxv. 6: comp. *Hengstb.* iii. p. 29 ff.

(4) In the period of the judges there was but *one national sanctuary*, the house of God at Shiloh (Judg. xviii. 31; comp. with Josh. xviii. 1, Ps. lxxviii. 60), or the tabernacle (1 Sam. ii. 22) with the ark (1 Sam. iv. 4 ff.), and the altar on which the offerings of the whole people were brought (1 Sam. i. 7, 9, 24, iii. 3, 15). No other places of worship are mentioned, except the altar built at Bethel, when the ark was there temporarily, during the war between Benjamin and the other tribes, ch. xx. 27, xxi. 2, 4; and the sacrifice of the people at Bochim, ch. ii. 5, of Gideon at Ophrah, ch. vi. 26, and of Manoah, ch. xiii. 19, the whole of which are justified by appearances of the angel of the Lord, are not at variance with the legal requirement of a single place of worship. That there were altars and sacrifices at Mizpah in Gilead, ch. xi. 11, and Mizpah in Benjamin, ch. xx. 1, xxi. 1, [if indeed it is not rather the same place in all the three texts], cannot be proved; since the expression "before Jehovah" in itself by no means presupposes the presence of the ark or the tabernacle, as is thought by *Movers*, die bibl. Chron. p. 290, and by *Bertheau*, pp. 157–8. See the proof of this in *Hengstb.* iii. p. 43 ff., which *Bertheau* ignores, but has not refuted.—The only violation of this law was at the private sanctuary of Micah, ch. xvii.; and its illegality is indicated by the remark, ver. 6, "In those days there was no king in Israel, but every man did that which was right in his own eyes."—The priesthood, too, is found in the tribe of Levi, and Phinehas the son of Eleazar, the son of Aaron, is the high priest,

ch. xx. 27, 28, comp. with Deut. x. 6, 8, Josh. xiv. 1, xvii. 4 ff., xxiv. 33; and he gives the answer to the people who ask counsel at God, in accordance with Num. xxvii. 21. The Levites are the privileged order of the servants of God; so that even the idolatrous Micah exerts himself to obtain a Levite as his priest, ch. xvii. 10, xix. 18; and the Levites carry the ark of God, 1 Sam. vi. 14, 15.—Prophets also arise, Judg. iv. 4, vi. 8, in the position assigned to them, Deut. xviii. 18; and there are holy women ministering at the tabernacle, 1 Sam. ii. 22, [probably also Judg. xi. 32–40], in harmony with Ex. xxxviii. 8.

With respect to the *rites of worship*, sacrifices were offered as the law prescribed, 1 Sam. ii. 28; and alleged cases of acting in a manner which it disallowed, upon closer consideration prove to be misconceptions (comp. *Hengstb.* p. 57), or as abuses, which do not abrogate the law. Vows are reckoned inviolable, ch. xi. 35 ff.; and they are conscientiously fulfilled when they are accompanied by sacrificial feasts, 1 Sam. i. 4, 21, in harmony with Deut. xii. 17, 18. Oaths are sworn to Jehovah, according to the law, Ex. xx. 7, Lev. xix. 12, Deut. v. 11; fasts are observed as the embodiment of repentance, ch. xx. 26, according to the appointment Lev. xvi. 29. Circumcision is reckoned the prerogative of the Israelites, ch. xiv. 3; the law of the Nazarite, ch. xiii. 3 ff., 1 Sam. i. 11, agrees with Num. vi. 2 ff.; and so the blowing of trumpets, iii. 27, vii. 18, is conformable to Num. x. 9; so also the observance of the law as to clean and unclean food, ch. xiii. 4, 14.—Annual feasts are celebrated at the sanctuary in Shiloh, ch. xxi. 19, 1 Sam. i. 3, ii. 14, according to Ex. xxiii. 15, xxxiv. 20, [23], Deut. xvi. 16, 17; also thanksgiving feasts at the harvest, חַלּוֹלִים, ch. ix. 27, according to Lev. xix. 24, [yet depraved by idolatry]; and the devoting to destruction is executed, ch. i. 17, xxi. 11, according to Deut. xiii. 13 ff.—That the Mosaic law as to *civil* matters was in force during the period of the judges may be seen from the marriage of the redeeming kinsman, Ruth iii. 12, comp. with Lev. xxv. 25, 48, 49, and Ruth iv. 2, and again vers. 5, 10, with Deut. xxv. 9, and again with ver. 6; from the disinclination of the godly for marriages with the uncircumcised, Judg. xiv. 3; and from the law of succession in force, ch. xi. 2, comp. with Gen. xxi. 10.—In the *political* relations we meet with the assembly of the people, עֵדָה, governed by elders, ch. xx. 1, xxi. 16, 22, just as in the Pentateuch. Among the tribes Judah has the pre-eminence and the chief command, i. 2, xx. 18, comp. Num. ii. 3, x. 14, Gen. xlix. 8 ff.—Gideon declines the kingdom for himself and his son, because Jehovah alone is king in Israel, ch. viii. 22, 23, in harmony with Deut. xvii. 14, Ex. xix. 5, 6, Deut. xxxiii. 5.—

Finally, in Deborah's song of triumph, ch. v., original passages in Deut. xxxiii. 2, Ex. xix. 16 ff., Gen. xlix., are imitated and freely reproduced.—Comp. *Hengstb.* p. 40 ff.

There is abundance also in the *books of Samuel* to show that the Pentateuch was the rule and standard of the theocratic life in Israel, from the times of Eli on to those of David (5). Although the book of the law of Moses is not expressly mentioned, yet we meet in these books with so many references to the words, quotations from them, and reminiscences of them, that they testify to its existence almost more strongly than if they had made outspoken appeals to it (6).

(5) Not only is public worship celebrated as the law prescribed at the tabernacle in Shiloh, under Eli and Samuel (1 Sam. i. and iii.), and later at Nob under Ahimelech, the son of Ahitub, the son of Phinehas, the son of Eli (1 Sam. xxi. 2 ff., comp. xxii. 9, 11, 20), while the ruin of the sons of Eli is the punishment of the transgressions of which they have been guilty (1 Sam. ii. 12–17, 22–36, iv. 15–22); not only is the ark reverenced as the centre of the glory of Jehovah (1 Sam. iv. 18–22), and, founding upon Num. x. 35, is carried along with the people into the war (1 Sam. iv. 3 ff.; 2 Sam. xi. 11), where even the Philistines are compelled to feel the omnipotence of the God of Israel manifesting Himself in this symbol (1 Sam. iv. 6 ff., v. 1–vi. 14), and is treated as the greatest of holy things, conformably to what the law prescribes (1 Sam. vi. 15; 2 Sam. vi. 12 ff., xv. 23 ff.), while every transgression with respect to it is punished with death (1 Sam. vi. 19 ff.; 2 Sam. vi. 6, 7, comp. with Num. iv. 20); but also, in all weighty matters, God is consulted by means of the Urim of the high priest, which was connected with the ephod (1 Sam. xiv. 3, 37, xxiii. 9 ff., xxx. 7). And the transgression of the commandments of Jehovah is restrained not only by Samuel (1 Sam. vii. 3 ff.), but also repeatedly by Saul—for instance, when he rooted out of the land the wizards and necromancers (1 Sam. xxviii. 3, comp. with Deut. xviii. 10, 11), and gave effect to the prohibition of eating blood (1 Sam. xiv. 33, comp. with Lev. iii. 17, Gen. ix. 4); and that authority is conceded without opposition to the prophets, with which Jehovah in the law had invested them (Deut. xviii. 18, 19; 1 Sam. ii. 27 ff., iii. 20, vii. 5 ff., x. 17 ff., xv.; 2 Sam. vii., xii. 1–15).

(6) The following are reminiscences of the law, or expressions borrowed from it:—1 Sam. ii. 13, word for word from Deut. xviii. 3. —The speech of Samuel, 1 Sam. xv. 29, contains a reminiscence of

the words of Num. xxiii. 19.—Especially conspicuous are the references made to the law in the transactions connected with the choice of a king, 1 Sam. viii.–x.—The elders of the people present their desire, ch. viii. 5, "Now make us a king to judge us, like all the nations," in words taken from the law for the kingdom, Deut. xvii. 14; and in doing so, when they demand that Samuel shall set a king over them, they take into account what that law goes on to prescribe, "Thou shalt in any wise set him king over thee *whom Jehovah thy God shall choose*," to which Samuel expressly refers when he has given them the king, ch. x. 24. And when the next verse relates that "Samuel told the people *the manner of the kingdom* [or its Rights], and wrote it in the book, and laid it up before Jehovah," the phrase כְּמִשְׁפַּט הַמְּלוּכָה is modelled upon Deut. xviii. 3, and וַיָּנַח לִפְנֵי יְהוָה is literally from Num. xvii. 22; and the transaction itself is a matter-of-fact confirmation of the laying up of the book of the law beside the ark. "Had the law of the Lord not been already lying before the ark, Samuel would scarcely have thought of laying up this writing there" (*Hengstb.* p. 252).—The testimony of Samuel to the people as to the administration of his office as judge, ch. xii. 3, is modelled entirely on the words of the law (Num. xvi. 15; Lev. v. 23; Num. xxxv. 31, 32; Lev. xx. 4); comp. also ch. xii. 14 with Deut. i. 26, 43, ix. 7, 23, xxxi. 27.—The devoting of the Amalekites to destruction, commanded by Samuel and executed by Saul, 1 Sam. xv., rests upon Ex. xvii. 8 ff. and Deut. xxv. 17–19.—There are many references to the Pentateuch in 2 Sam. vii.; especially vers. 22–24 consist of scarcely anything else than words of Deuteronomy—for instance, ch. iv. 7, x. 21, xiii. 6, comp. with Lev. xxvi. 20 [?], Ex. xix. 5. Comp. besides *Häv.* § 137. —Such strongly marked and numerous matter-of-fact traces cannot be obliterated by the remark, that "the latest composers of the books of Samuel and Judges are acquainted with the Pentateuch, and write in the spirit of the fifth book" (*De Wette*, Einl. § 162, *b*).

Of the historical works of the succeeding times, the *books of Kings* present not only a multitude of references to the Pentateuch, but also not a few direct quotations from it (7). Solomon's prayer at the dedication of the temple (1 Kings viii. and 2 Chron. v. 2–vii. 10) forms a great commentary on the law, especially upon the blessing and curse set forth to the people by Moses in Lev. xxvi. and Deut. xxviii. (8). The narratives of what Elijah and Elisha performed in the kingdom of the ten tribes bear testimony that there also the law of Moses was known, was widely spread, and was in force (9). Besides, through-

out the whole work, not only is there the strictest respect paid to the law, but this is done with verbal references to the law of Moses; prominence is given to the commandments, the ordinances, the statutes, and the judgments which Jehovah had communicated to Moses (1 Kings ii. 3, vi. 12, 13, ix. 4, xi. 33, 34; 2 Kings x. 31, xxiii. 21, etc.); the "testimony" was delivered to king Joash at his coronation (2 Kings xi. 12); and finally, under Josiah the autograph of the law was found in the temple (2 Kings xxii. 8 ff.) (10).—In *the books of Chronicles*, on account of their Levitico-priestly point of view, there are such numerous traces of the existence of the law of Moses, and of its authority as regulating the life and the worship of the people, that the opponents of the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch have rejected the credibility of their historical representations principally on account of these frequent appeals to the law (11).—In the books later than the exile—*Ezra* and *Nehemiah*—the traces of the Mosaic law are acknowledged without contradiction (12).

(7) Comp. *Kanne*, bibl. Untersuchungen u. Auslegg. mit u. ohne Polemik, ii. Thle., Erlangen 1819–20; *J. M. Hertz*, Sind in den BB. der Könige Spuren des Pent. u. der mos. Gesetze zu finden, Altona 1822.

(8) See the particulars pointed out in *my* commentary on 1 Kings viii. 22 ff.

(9) Comp. *Hengstb.* iii. pp. 126–180, where, at the same time, there is a refutation of the objections to the existence of the Pentateuch in the kingdom of the ten tribes. Elijah's first words to Ahab, 1 Kings xvii. 1, are an individualizing of Deut. xi. 16, 17; comp. Lev. xxvi. 19, Deut. xxviii. 23, 24. His sacrifice upon Mount Carmel, xviii. 23, 33, is performed according to Lev. i. 6–8; and the form of the decisive test selected by him, ver. 22 ff. and ver. 39, relies upon Lev. ix. 23, 24. The whole narrative of his journey to Horeb, ch. xix., rests upon the Pentateuch: the forty days correspond to the forty years during which Israel was led through the wilderness; the food brought to him by the angel corresponds to the manna, as the Lord's appearance to him corresponds to that vouchsafed to Moses: comp. ver. 9 with Ex. xxxiii. 21 ff., xxxiv. 6. Naboth's refusal to sell the inheritance of his fathers (ch. xxi. 3) relies upon Lev. xxv. 23 and Num. xxxvi. 8; the judicial proceeding against him (ver. 10) upon Deut. xvii. 6, 7, xix. 15, Num. xxxv. 30; and the accusation upon Deut. xiii. 11, xvii. 5, and Ex. xxii. 27. The speech of Micaiah

(ch. xxii. 17) has reference to Num. xxvii. 16, 17. The פִּי שְׁנַיִם in 2 Kings ii. 9 is explicable only from Deut. xxi. 17. The removal of Elijah from this world (ch. ii. 3, 5, 10, 11) alludes to Gen. v. 24. Comp. also ch. iii. 19 with Deut. xx. 19, 20; ch. iii. 20 with Ex. xxix. 38 ff.; ch. iv. 1 with Lev. xxv. 40; ch. iv. 16 with Gen. xviii. 10, 14; ver. 42 with Deut. xviii. 4, 5, Lev. ii. 14, xxiii. 14, and Num. xviii. 13; ch. v. 7 with Deut. xxxii. 39; ch. vi. 28 ff. is a fulfilment of Lev. xxvi. 29, Deut. xxviii. 53, 57, 58; ch. vii. 2, 19 contains a reminiscence of Gen. vii. 11. The account of the lepers, ch. vii. 3 ff., shows that the law, Num. v. 3, Lev. xiii. 46, was exactly followed out. Even when the calf-worship is set up, 1 Kings xii. 28, Jeroboam rests the proceeding on Ex. xxxii. 4. Comp., besides, 1 Kings xii. 33 with Num. xvi. 28.

(10) It is a purely arbitrary assumption, giving itself the airs of criticism, which can explain this finding of the law as being the first certain trace of the existence of our present Pentateuch (*De Wette, v. Lengerke*, and others). Comp. *Häv.* i. 2, p. 534 ff.; *my* Commentary, pp. 571–2; and *Delitzsch*, Gen. i. pp. 9, 10.

(11) Comp. *De Wette*, Beitrr. i. pp. 4, 5, Einleit. § 161; and, on the other side, *my* Apolog. Versuch üb. d. Chron. p. 262 ff.

(12) Even *De Wette*, Einl. § 162, *a*, note, adduces the following: Ezra iii. 2, vi. 18, vii. 6, 12 (Ezra, a scribe of the law), ver. 10, ix. 1 ff.; Neh. i. 7 ff. (comp. ver. 9 with Deut. xxx. 4, xii. 11), viii. 1 ff., ix. 2 ff., xiii. 1.

II. All *prophecy*, also, derives from the Pentateuch its whole right to exist and act, and finds in it the materials for its predictions; while we never distinguish a whisper of contradiction to the prophets, who speak in the words of the law, direct attention back to the law, continue its predictions, and threaten with its curses (13). Not only the prophets in the kingdom of Judah from first to last (14), but also Hosea and Amos, whose sphere of labour was within the ten tribes (15), are acquainted with the historical narratives in the Pentateuch, which they apply to the purposes of exhortation and consolation; and also with the commands and prohibitions of the law, which they use for rebuking the sins of their contemporaries; and with its threatenings and promises, the sure fulfilment of which they proclaim, with special reference to the relations of each individual period.

(13) *Delitzsch*, die Genesis, i. p. 11 ff.

(14) Already *Obadiah*, probably the oldest of the minor prophets

[see on this subject § 81, especially Note 3], "alludes in ver. 4, שִׁים קִנְּךָ, to Num. xxiv. 21; and in vers. 17–19 he announces a new realization of the prophecy in vers. 18, 19, whose predictive character he had just acknowledged by that quotation" (*Hengstb.* Bileam [Balaam], p. 253; *Caspari*, Obadja, pp. 65 and 129).—*Joel* not only assumes the existence of the Levitical worship [*Auberlen* in *Herzog's* Encyclopædia, art. Joel, notices that there is not in his prophecy a trace of any worship on high places; the one centre, the only place thought of for sacrifice and meeting with Jehovah, is the temple at Jerusalem. He notices, besides, the uncertainty as to the age in which Joel lived; but remarks that the higher the antiquity we assign to him, the more striking becomes his anticipation of a general captivity, the heart and conscience of the people being moved to think of this in connection with partial sufferings already come upon them; and while he attributes the prediction to supernatural foresight, he also attributes an influence in the minds of both prophets and people to their acquaintance with Deut. xxviii., etc.], but he also furnishes distinct references to the Pentateuch, sometimes in its very words. Such are ch. i. 10 referring to Deut. xxviii. 51; ii. 3 to Gen. xiii. 10; ii. 17 to Deut. xv. 6; ii. 2, word for word from Ex. x. 14; ii. 13 from Ex. xxxiv. 6, xxxii. 14. Compare, further, ii. 23 with Deut. xi. 13, 14; iii. 3 with Deut. vi. 22; and on this, see *Hengstb.* Christol. i. pp. 375, 387–8.—*Isaiah* lives in a very special degree in the law, to which he also refers in ch. xxx. 9. His introductory address is throughout rooted in the Pentateuch: vers. 2–4 in Deut. xxxii.; vers. 5–9 in the threatenings, Lev. xxvi. and Deut. xxviii.; vers. 10–17 in the laws of the Pentateuch for the sacrifices and the feasts, and the commandments to exercise justice, especially in the case of the widows and orphans, the poor and needy. See the proofs at large in *Caspari*, Beitrr. z. Einleit. in d. B. des Jesaja, pp. 204 ff., and *Drechsler*, Jesaj. i. p. 96. Ch. iii. 9 points so distinctly back to Gen. xix. 5, that even *Hitzig* infers that the narrative in Gen. xix. lay before Isaiah in a written form. Ch. xi. 15, 16 refers to the event in Ex. xiv.; and the song of praise, ch. xii., to that in Ex. xv.: comp. *Hitzig*, Jes. p. 151. Ch. xxiv. 18*c* is word for word from Gen. vii. 11. The accusation of the people in ch. xxx. 9 is modelled after Deut. xxxii. 6, 20. At ch. xxx. 17, *Gesenius* himself remarks that Lev. xxvi. 8 and Deut. xxxii. 30 are almost verbal parallels, etc.—Equally numerous and strongly marked are the references to the Pentateuch in *Micah.* Ch. i. 7 points to the law, Deut. xxiii. 10 [19? or ix. 21?]; ch. v. 5, "the land of Nimrod," is taken from Gen. x. 10; ch. v. 6*b* is from Deut. xxxii. 2; ch. vi. 1, 2 goes back upon Deut. xxxii. 1; ver. 4, "I redeemed thee out of the

house of servants," is derived from Ex. xiii. 3, xx. 2; ver. 5 is founded upon Num. xxii.–xxiv. (comp. *Hengstb.* Bileam, p. 252); of ver. 8 already *Maurer* says, that it is as like Deut. x. 12 as one egg is to another; vers. 13–16 are a summary repetition of the threatened punishments in Lev. xxvi. and Deut. xxviii., and other places. Comp. *Caspari, ibid.* p. 211, and his Micha der Morasthite, pp. 419–427.—*Nahum*, in his introduction, designates God by predicates belonging to the Pentateuch, ver. 2, אֵל קַנּוֹא, Ex. xx. 5, Deut. iv. 24 (and as regards the form קַנּוֹא, Josh. xxiv. 19); ver. 3 is word for word drawn from Num. xiv. 17, 18, Ex. xxxiv. 6, 7.—Of *Habakkuk*, it is beyond all doubt that ch. iii. 3 has its roots in Deut. xxxiii. 2, as this chapter presents other unmistakeable points of contact (comp. *Delitzsch*, Habak. p. 119).—*Zephaniah* frequently has references to the Pentateuch, especially to Deuteronomy: comp. ch. i. 13 with Deut. xxviii. 30, 39; ch. i. 15 with Deut. v. 21, [otherwise ver. 19]; ch. i. 16, 17, with Deut. xxviii. 52 and 29; ch. i. 18 with Deut. xxxii. 21, 22; ch. iii. 5 with Deut. xxxii. 4; ch. iii. 19 with Deut. xxvi. 17–19; and see *Strauss*, vatic. Zeph. p. xxviii. There is no need for more particular proof that the succeeding prophets refer to the Pentateuch, as this is generally seen and acknowledged. *De Wette*, Einl. § 162, *b*, says: "In Jeremiah and Ezekiel, the acquaintance with our Pentateuch is pretty obvious: comp. Jer. iv. 23 with Gen. i. 2; ch. v. 19 with Gen. xv. 13; ch. xxxii. 18 with Ex. xx. 5, 6; ch. xi. 1–8, particularly ver. 4, with Deut. iv. 20 (ver. 8 referring to Deut. xxviii.); ch. xxiii. 17, comp. Deut. xxix. 17, 18; ch. xxxiv. 14 with Ex. xxi. 2, Deut. xv. 12; ch. xlviii. 45, 46, with Num. xxi. 28, 29; Ezek. xx. 5 with Ex. vi. 3, 4; ver. 11 with Lev. xviii. 5; ch. xxii. 26 with Lev. x. 10, 11; ch. xliv. 20 ff. with Lev. xxi. 2 ff.; ver. 28 with Num. xviii. 20; ch. xx. 6, 15 with Ex. iii. 8, etc.; ch. xviii. 7 with Deut. xxiv. 11 ff." Yet the number of references in these two prophets to the Pentateuch is really much greater: this has been shown, in the case of the former, by *Küper*, Jeremias libr. ss. interpr. pp. 1–51; and with respect to the latter, it is at once clear from the list of words and phrases taken from the Pentateuch by Ezekiel, which have been collected by *Zunz*, d. gotterdienstl. Vorträge der Juden (Berlin 1832), pp. 160–1.

(15) *Amos* denounces ruin upon Judah, ch. ii. 4, "because they have despised the law of Jehovah, and have not kept His commandments." Ch. ii. 7 rests upon Ex. xxiii. 6, Deut. xvi. 19, xxiv. 17, xxvii. 19, Lev. xx. 3, Deut. xxvii. 18 [? perhaps vers. 20–23], etc.; ch. ii. 8 upon Ex. xxii. 25, 26, Deut. xxiv. 12 ff.; ch. ii. 9 upon Num. xiii. 32, 33; ch. ii. 10 upon Deut. xxix. 4; ch. ii. 11, 12, upon Num. vi. 3, Deut. xviii. 15; ch. iii. 2 upon Deut. xiv. 2; ch. iv. 4, 5,

upon Num. xxiv. [xxviii.?] 3, Deut. xiv. 28, xxvi. 12, and Lev. ii. 11, vii. 12, xxii. 18 ff.; ch. iv. 9, 10 upon Deut. xxviii. 22, 27, Lev. xxvi. 25; ch. iv. 11 upon Deut. xxix. 22; ch. v. 11 upon Deut. xxviii. 30, 39. According to ch. v. 21, 22, the feasts were celebrated and the sacrifices were offered in the kingdom of Israel, as the law prescribed. The prophet's deprecatory prayer for his people, ch. vii. 1 ff., is on the model of that of Moses, Ex. xxxii. 9–14, Num. xiv. 11 ff. In ch. ix., ver. 3 refers to Num. xxi. 6; ver. 8 to Deut. vi. 15; ver. 12 to Deut. xxviii. 9, 10; ver. 14 is from Deut. xxx. 3, etc.—The references in *Hosea* to the Pentateuch are almost in greater number: comp. ch. ii. 1 with Gen. xxii. 17, xxxii. 13; ch. ii. 2, 17, with Ex. i. 10, Deut. xvii. 15; ch. ii. 10 with Deut. vii. 13, xi. 14; ch. ii. 19 with Ex. xxiii. 13; ch. iii. 1 with Deut. vii. 8, xxxi. 18; ch. iv. 10 with Lev. xxvi. 26; ch. v. 6 with Ex. x. 9; ch. v. 14 with Deut. xxxii. 39; ch. ix. 4 and 10 with Deut. xxvi. 14, xxxii. 10, and Num. xxv. 3, etc. In ch. xi. and xii. we find a multitude of allusions to the ancient history of the people—allusions which themselves imply that the people were most exactly acquainted with Genesis and Exodus. See this more copiously in *Hengstb.* Beitrr. ii. p. 48 ff.

III. and lastly. The *poetical literature* of the age of David and Solomon likewise presupposes the Pentateuch as the stem upon which it blossoms. The first psalm, which serves as an introduction to the Psalter, gives us to understand that the *Psalms* are a precious fruit of the life of Israel under and in the law, whose glory is praised in Ps. xix. 8 ff., cxix., etc., and with which the holy singers were familiar, not only with its legislation, but also with its historical contents, as we learn from the national psalms and the psalms of nature (viii., lxvi., lxviii., lxxviii., xcv., civ., cv., cvi., cxiv., cxxxvi., etc.); and they even mention it as Scripture (מְגִלָּה, Ps. xl. 8) (16). In like manner, the *Proverbs* of Solomon are a fruit of reflection upon the divine revelation given in the law, and confirmed by the singular way in which Israel had been guided; although its peculiar aim and character prevent the exhibition of many references to the very words of individual passages in the Pentateuch (17). In the book of *Job*, too, the problem with whose solution it is occupied points back to the Mosaic law; and in spite of the more general point of view which it takes on account of its peculiar aim, yet it presents several undeniable references to the Pentateuch (18). [The like is also true of the book of *Ecclesiastes*,

though *Keil* passes it over, on account of his falling in with the common modern view of its later composition]; and even the *Canticles* betray acquaintance with Genesis, by mentioning Mahanaim at ch. vii. 1 (19).

(16) Comp. the collection of references in the Psalms to single passages and laws in the Pentateuch, in *Jahn*, Einl. ii. p. 28 ff.; *Häv.* i. 2, pp. 557–8; and these may easily be greatly multiplied.

(17) Prov. viii. 22 ff. very manifestly shows acquaintance with Gen. i., and ch. xxxi. 3 with Deut. xvii. 17.

(18) See below, the introduction to the book of Job, and *Häv.* Einl. iii. pp. 304–5.

(19) Comp. *Delitzsch*, Genesis, i. p. 14.

Thus the entire historical, prophetical, and poetical writings point back to the Pentateuch as their source and starting-point, and bear witness, not only to its existence from the days of Joshua onwards, but also to its mighty influence upon the life of the people, and the historical development of the theocracy.

§ 35. *Testimony of the Synagogue and of the Christian Church.*

On account of this unanimous tradition, not only has the Jewish synagogue acknowledged the Mosaic origin of the law as an immoveably certain article of faith (1); but also the Christian Church has held fast this belief, which has been confirmed by the testimony of Christ and His apostles (2), without permitting itself to be led astray by individual doubts on the subject which emerged in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries (3).

(1) That all the Jewish sects and parties—Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes, Palestinian and Alexandrian Jews, and Samaritans—with one mind acknowledged the law to be a divinely inspired writing of Moses, is an established fact which needs no further proof. First, *Isaac ben Jasos*, at the beginning of the eleventh century, and *Aben Ezra* on Deut. i. 1, in a passage considered to be very obscure, expressed doubts as to individual passages in the Pentateuch being the composition of Moses; comp. *Maier*, in the theol. Studien u. Krit. 1832, p. 634 ff. [*Bleek*, p. 167, says the former author was quoted by the latter on Gen. xxxvi. 31, as thinking that the passage was written in the time of Jehoshaphat. In this opinion *Aben Ezra* himself did not concur; but he expressed doubts as to Gen. xii. 6, xxii. 14, Deut.

i. 1, iii. 11, xxxiv., yet with such extreme caution that it is difficult to know his own sentiments.] An appeal is made to *Aben Ezra* by *Baruch* (Benedict) *Spinoza*, who was expelled from the synagogue on account of his atheism. In his tractatus theol. polit. 1670, ch. viii. ix., he decides against Moses on account of various passages and utterances in the Pentateuch; and he declares Ezra to be the author of it, as well as of the rest of the historical books of the Old Testament. He found, however, an able opponent in the Dutchman *Franc. Cuper*, Arcana Atheismi refutata, Rotterod. 1676.

(2) Not only do Christ and His apostles share this conviction with their contemporaries (for instance, Matt. xix. 7, Mark xii. 19, John i. 45; comp. *Josephus*, Antiq. xvii. 6. 3), but they also expressly confirm it (John v. 46, 47; comp. Luke xxiv. 27, 44, Mark xii. 26), and adduce various historical and legislative portions of the Pentateuch as true history and divine revelation; for instance, Rom. x. 5, Acts xv. 25 [? is it vers. 21, 28 ?], Heb. xiii. 12, 13, etc. The objection by which all the opponents of the genuineness, from *Clericus* to *De Wette* (Einl. p. 204), have wished to set aside this weighty authority, that Christ and His apostles did not come into the world to teach the Jews criticism, and that faith in Christ cannot set limits to critical inquiries (and doubts), has been already answered excellently by *Herm. Witsius* (Miscellan. Sacr. i. p. 117): "Enim vero non fuere Christus et apostoli critices doctores, quales se haberi postulant, qui hodie sibi regnum litterarum in quavis vindicant scientia; fuerunt tamen doctores veritatis, neque passi sunt, sibi per communem ignorantiam aut procerum astum imponi. Non certe in mundum venere, ut vulgares errores foverent suaque auctoritate munirent, nec per Judæos solum sed et populos unice a se pendentes longe lateque spargerent." Comp. also *Häv.* i. 2, § 144.

(3) The doubts of the Gnostic *Ptolemæus*, of the *Nazarenes*, and of the *Clementines*, adduced by *De Wette* (Einl. § 164), [and *Bleek*, pp. 166–7], are more against the divine origin of the law than against its Mosaic authorship; and they are destitute of critical importance, like the attempts of *Celsus* and *Julian* to represent individual narratives in the Pentateuch as myths, and to furnish heathen myths as parallel to them. It is still more perverse in *De Wette* (at the same place) to adduce as a doubt of its genuineness the utterance of *Jerome*, c. Helvidium, "Sive Mosen dicere volueris auctorem Pentateuchi, sive Ezram ejusdem instauratorem operis, non recuso;" comp. *Häv.* p. 569. —The first doubt as to the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch was expressed by *Carlstadt* in his Libellus de canonicis scripturis (Witteb. 1520, reprinted in *Credner*, zur Geschichte des Kanons, 1847), where

he says, § 81 (or p. 364 in *Credner*), "Certum est, Mosen legem Dei, divinitus acceptam populo dedisse, verum cujus sit dictis quinque librorum atque sermonis filum, dubitare potest;" and § 85 (pp. 368–9), from Deut. xxxiv. 5 ff. he infers, "defendi posse, Mosen non fuisse scriptorem quinque librorum, quoniam sepulto Mose filum orationis idem invenimus, non eundem Mosen." But he also rejects as untenable the opinion that Ezra wrote the history in the books of Moses, on account of Deut. xxxi. 25 ff., Josh. xxiv. 26, 2 Kings xxii. 8; and the result at which he arrives is, "autorem historiæ Mosaicæ scriptorem incertum esse, neque inter Judæos convenire" (§ 87 and 89). —At a later time, *A. Masius* [a Roman Catholic lawyer, born in the neighbourhood of Brussels, died 1573 in the territory of Cleves, says *Bleek*, p. 168] expresses himself thus, Commentar. in Jos. (1574), præf. p. 2, "Pentateuchum longo post Mosen tempore, interjectis saltem hic illic verborum et sententiarum clausulis, veluti sarcitum, atque omnino explicatius redditum esse;" and at ch. xix. 47, "Neque Mosis libros sic ut nunc habentur ab illo esse compositos certum est; sed ab Ezdra aut alio quopiam divino viro, qui pro vetustis et exoletis locorum nominibus, quibus rerum gestarum memoria posset optime et perspici et conservari, reposuerit." If *Masius* accordingly assumed that the work had afterwards been re-written, *Ant. van Dale* [a learned Mennonite in the Netherlands, who died 1708, says *Bleek*, p. 170], de origine et progressu idolol. (1696), p. 71, and epistol. ad *Steph. Morin. ibid.* p. 686, distinguished between the codex of the Mosaic law and the Pentateuch, which latter Ezra may have composed "ex directione et instinctu divino, cum ex codice legis (quem totum huic operi inseruit) tum ex aliis libris, historicis quidem at vere propheticis." The genuineness was more decidedly rejected by *Thomas Hobbes* in his Leviathan (1651), c. xxxiii.; and it was disputed with all sorts of shallow reasons by *Is. Peyrerius*, Systema theol. ex Præadamitarum hypothesi (1655), l. iv. c. i.; by *Rich. Simon*, hist. crit. du V. Test. i. 5; and by *Clericus*, Sentimens de quelques Théologiens de Hollande, etc. (1685), Lettre vi. On the other hand, it was defended by *Heidegger*, exercitt. bibl. i. 246 sqq.; by *Herm. Witsius*, *l.c.* t. i. p. 84 sqq. (ed. nov. 1736); and by *Carpzov*, Introd. i. p. 38 sqq.: so that *Clericus* himself, at a later time (1693, says *Bleek*, p. 169), in Dissert. iii., de scriptore Pent. Mose ejusque consilio, prefixed to his Commentary on the Pentateuch, retracted his doubts.

§ 36. *Assaults upon the Genuineness of the Pentateuch, and Defences of it.*

On the contrary, faith in the divine revelation of the old covenant was undermined by the prevalent Naturalism and Rationalism of the second half of last century.; and so, when every supernatural manifestation of God to and in Israel was denied, the genuineness of the books of Moses could not but be also disputed and rejected (1). For as success could not attend the attempt to explain the miracles in the Pentateuch on natural principles (2), there remained nothing for the understanding which had become estranged from the word of God, but to give out that the miracles were myths: and this undertaking could be attended with a measure of success, only if men started with the supposition that these narratives originated some centuries subsequent to the events; and if this axiom, settled *à priori*, were then clothed in the garb of historical criticism by means of various historical and linguistic arguments (3).

(1) The foundation for the rejection of the genuineness of the Pentateuch was laid by the writings of *John Spencer*, de legibus Hebræorum ritualibus, etc.; of *Jo. Clericus*, Commentar. in Pent.; and of *Joh. Dav. Michaelis*, Mosaisches Recht; which did not indeed dispute the genuineness itself, yet in a deistical and naturalistic way gave a thoroughly superficial view of its divine contents. As soon, then, as faith in the divine revelation, still outwardly retained, became exposed to the attacks of Deism and Naturalism, the surrender of the genuineness of the Pentateuch was inevitable, since its contents were in contradiction to what had become the ruling ideas of the time. Comp. *Hengstb.* Beitrr. ii. p. ii. ff., for a comprehensive representation of the forces operating to bring on the rejection of the Pentateuch.

(2) *Eichhorn* persisted in this attempt in the four editions of his Introduction to the Old Testament; although in the fourth he had to make so many concessions to the opponents, that his defence of the genuineness veered round into almost the opposite. [*Bleek*, p. 175, sums it up in this: that all Leviticus, and Deut. i.–xxxii., were entirely by Moses; that Genesis was put together from documents older than Moses; and that the whole Pentateuch, with the exception of a few glosses, was collected and arranged between the time of Joshua and that of Samuel.]

(3) Many have openly declared that dogmatical offence at the

miracles and prophecies constitutes the strength of the resistance on the part of almost all our opponents. Comp. the collection of such declarations in *Hengstb.* p. xl. ff. Thus *De Wette* says, in the third edition of his Einl. § 145: "If it is a settled point with the educated (!) mind that *such* miracles (as the Pentateuch contains) cannot actually take place, the question arises, whether they might have perhaps *assumed this appearance* to eye-witnesses and persons taking part in the transactions; but this also must be answered in the negative, etc. . . . And consequently we arrive at this result, that the narrative is neither contemporaneous, nor derived from contemporaneous sources." This result is still placed at the head of the whole investigation in the seventh edition, as "a legitimate prejudice," although here the premiss is much more warily expressed: "If it is at least doubtful to a reflecting mind, whether *such* miracles can actually take place," etc. This revolution in dogmatic conviction also explains how the opponents who have appeared since 1790 have turned their weapons principally against the contents of the Pentateuch; and instead of merely disputing its Mosaic authorship, have at the same time rejected the Mosaic origin of the entire legislation, and have pronounced the whole contents of the books of Moses unhistorical. The first timid attempt [exclusive of an assault by *Hasse*, afterwards abandoned by him, as noticed a little further forward] was made by *Fulda*, [a minister in Würtemberg, who died in 1788, leaving this paper, which was published posthumously, says *Bleek*, p. 171], in *Paulus*, Neu Repert. iii. (1791), and in his Memorabil. vii. He was followed by *Corrodi*, [a Swiss anti-supernaturalist, who died in 1793], Beleuchtung des jüd. and christl. Bibelcanons (1792), i. p. 58 ff.; *Otmar* (that is, *Nachtigal*) [*Johann Christoph Nachtigall*, died 1819, says *Bleek*], Fragmente über die allmäl. Bildung der den Isr. heil. Schriften, in *Henke's* Magazin f. Kirchengesch. (1794), ii. p. 433 ff., iv. pp. 1–36, 329 ff., also v. p. 291 ff., Neuer Versuch über die eilf Abschn. d. Gen.; against which *Eckermann*, Theol. Beitrr. v. p. 1 ff. (1796), in particular entered the lists [*Jac. Casp. Rud. Eckermann*, died 1836: he held that the Pentateuch in its present form must have been older than the division of the kingdoms, on account of the reception of it by the Samaritans, though it might perhaps be of the age of Samuel or David, says *Bleek*, p. 172]; *G. L. Bauer*, Einl. in d. Alte Testament (1801), p. 301 ff. of the second edition; *E. Chr. Schuster*, älteste Sagen d. Bibel, Lüneburg (1804); *H. E. G. Paulus*, Comment über d. N. Test. iv. pp. 230–1 (1804); and *Bertholdt*, Einl. iii. p. 759 ff. (1813): all of whom, however, still acknowledged many elements of the Pentateuch to be Mosaic. Bolder and more logical in their denial

that anything belonged to Moses unless a few genealogical lists, were the assaults of *J. S. Vater*, in his Commentary, iii. p. 393 ff. [1805; very much negative, yet asserting that a considerable part of Deuteronomy was in writing in the age of Solomon or of David, says *Bleek*]; *De Wette*, Beitrr. zur Einl. i. and ii. (1806–7), and in the various editions of his Lehrbuch d. Einl.; *Augusti*, Lehrbuch d. Einl. 1806 [keeping close to *Vater*, says *Bleek*]; *C. F. Volney*, Recherches nouv. sur l'histoire ancienne, P. i., Paris 1814; *Gesenius*, Gesch. d. hebräisch. Sprache, 1815, and de Pentat. Samar. 1815; *Bleek*, aphorist. Beitrr. zu den Unters. über den Pent., in Rosenmüller's Repert. i. p. 1 ff., 1822, whereas there is an important change for the better in his Beitrr. zu den Forsch. über den Pent., in the theol. Studien u. Krit. 1831, p. 488 ff. [*Bleek*, pp. 175–6, gives his own account of these two papers, as follows. In the former, occupying seventy-nine pages, he asserted, § 1, that there is a considerable portion which cannot have been composed later than the Mosaic age, such as songs and laws; § 2, that there is nothing to compel us to place the last redaction in the age of the exile; while § 3 treated of the composition or collection of the several books, and of the relation of the whole to the book of Joshua; and § 4, of the origin of the Samaritano-Alexandrine recension of the Pentateuch. In his latter paper, occupying thirty-six pages, he sought to show that Lev. xvii. and many other laws could not be later than the Mosaic age. He says that he wrote both with a reference to *De Wette*, who had so far modified his views in the interval between the two publications. And referring to the list of writers and their works which is given here by *Keil*, he says that he would certainly be astonished and shocked to find himself classed with the next three, who all held the Pentateuch to be a work chiefly of the Babylonian exile; *von Bohlen* and *Vatke* assigning Deuteronomy to the age of Josiah, and making it the earliest of the five books,—an opinion in which *George* coincides with them. To this peculiar view of theirs *Keil* has already adverted in § 28, note 1.] *G. A. Schumann*, Prolegg. in Pentat. p. xxxvi. sq.; *P. von Bohlen*, Genes. p. xxvii. sqq. [1835, he himself dying in 1839, says *Bleek*, p. 176]; *Hartmann*, hist. krit. Forsch. [ü. d. Bildung, das Zeitalter, u. d. Plan, d. 5 Bücher Mosis, 1831, says *Bleek*, p. 176], and in several other writings; *Vatke*, bibl. Theologie, i. [1835, says *Bleek*, p. 176], and by others: comp. the exposition of the various views in regard to both the Mosaic origin and the historical character of the Pentateuch, in *Hengstb.* Beitrr. ii. p. lx. ff. [*Bleek*, p. 177, adds *Ernst Bertheau*, die sieben Gruppen Mosaischer Gesetze, Göttingen 1840, according to whom the three middle books are a large, original,

genuine collection of laws; but he does not decide whether these were written down by Moses himself, or whether they were preserved by tradition. These make seven groups, each of seven series, each of ten laws; the other laws he considers to be later, and the history much later.]—The opposition took a new turn in connection with the cultivation of the hypothesis of supplements (§ 23, Note 7); since its defenders not only held the greater part of the laws to be Mosaic, and even many of the narratives to be genuine historical matter, only obscured by legends, but also moderated their scepticism considerably in respect to the time of composition. *Stähelin*, krit. Unters. über der Pent. pp. 97–8, places the composition of the fundamental (Elohistic) document in the earliest times of the judges; *Bleek*, de libri Geneseos origine atque indole crit. observationes, in the Bonner Programm for the year 1836 [directed against *von Bohlen*, he says himself, p. 176; and at p. 263 he repeats the opinion of the programme as apparently his own matured conviction], and *Tuch*, p. xci. ff., in the time of Saul; *Killisch*, in that of David; *Ewald* and *v. Lengerke*, pp. xci. xcii. [*Bleek*, p. 180, says there is not much new in him], in that of Solomon; *De Wette*, § 158, in that of the kings. The supplementer wrote, according to *Stähelin*, p. 120 ff., under Saul; according to *Tuch*, p. xcviii., in the age of Solomon; according to *v. Lengerke*, p. cii. ff., and *De Wette*, § 159, in the first half of the eighth century B.C. [*Bleek*, at p. 263 ff., having expressed his opinion that the Elohist must have written before the tribe of Judah attained to pre-eminence, and before Jerusalem became the seat of the sanctuary and of the civil government, in pp. 268–271, says the like of the Jehovist, observing that the two places which the Elohist much honoured—Bethel and Beersheba—became abominations to the Jews after the division of the kingdom. *Vaihinger*, p. 334 ff., follows *Ewald's* hypothesis in its great outlines. He makes the Vor-Elohist, of whom we have merely fragments, write in the twelfth century before Christ, using *Ewald's* so-called Buch der Bündnisse and other sources of information; the Elohist, in the tenth century; the Jehovist, in the eighth; and the Harmonist, in the end of the sixth, or the beginning of the seventh.] Deuteronomy is said by *De Wette*, § 160, and by *v. Lengerke*, p. cxxi., to have been written under Josiah; by *Ewald*, Geschichte, i. p. 171, and by *Riehm*, § 18, during the second half of the reign of Manasseh, and in Egypt according to *Ewald*, [who, however, in his second edition, has modified his view, and thinks that the writer had gone over the entire laws of Moses, and that it was edited to its present form in the end of the seventh century: see *Bleek*, p. 180. *Bleek* himself, pp. 299–304,

places the composition of Deuteronomy, at the earliest, in the age of Ahaz—more probably not before Hezekiah; but he thinks it would be absurd to place it during the exile, as do *Gesenius*, de Pent. Samar., and *De Wette* in his first and second editions; his arguments being connected with the view of the captivity which the book presents—the references to it in Jeremiah, and probably in Ezekiel, and the discovery of the law in the reign of Josiah, including this part of it, which was probably written under a wicked king, to whom the terrible threatenings apply—for instance, Manasseh. In pp. 304–6 he assigns a somewhat earlier date to Deut. xxxii. xxxiii., very probably the age of Uzziah. *Vaihinger* assigns the book to the reign of Hezekiah.]

In opposition to these assaults upon the genuineness of the Pentateuch, there appeared defences by *Jahn*, Einl. vol. ii., and Beitrr. zur Vertheidigung der Echtheit der Pent., in *Bengel's* Archiv, vols. ii. and iii. [1818, 1819] (profoundly, considering his time); by *Hasse*, Entdeckungen [see in § 23, Note 6; *Bleek*, p. 170, names him *John Gottfried Hasse*, Professor at Königsberg, died 1806] (weak and arbitrary, while his Aussichten zu künftigen Aufklärungen üb. d. Alte Testament, 1785, p. 15 ff., contains a superficial attack on the genuineness); *Griesinger*, üb. den Pent., Stuttgart 1806 (unimportant); *Chr. Fr. Fritzsche* [died at Zürich, 1850, says *Bleek*, p. 173], Prüfung der Gründe mit welchen neuerlich die Æchtheit der BB. Mos. bestritten worden, Leipzig 1814 [*Bleek*, p. 173, names *Kelle*, a minister in Saxony, Vorurtheilsfreie Würdigung d. Mosaisch. Schriften, Freiberg 1811–12]; *J. G. Scheibel*, Unterss. über Bibel u. Kirchengesch., Part i. 1816; *Kanne*, bibl. Unterss. u. Ausslegg. i. and ii. [1819–20, the first against *Vater*, the second against *De Wette*, says *Bleek*, p. 174]; *Pustkuchen*, hist. krit. Unterss. der bibl. Urgeschichte, nebst Unterss. über Alter, Verfasser, u. Einheit, der übrigen Theile des Pent., Halle 1823 [*Bleek*, p. 174, says that in his opinion the first eleven chapters of Genesis were admitted into the Canon at a very late period]; *J. G. Herbst*, observatt. de Pentateuchi iv. librorum poster. auctore et editore (1817, 4to [8vo, according to *Bleek*]), enlarged in the Commentatt. theol. edd. *Rosenmüller*, etc. i. 1 (1825), and in *Herbst's* own Einleit. in d. Alte Testament (with important concessions) [*Bleek*, p. 174, says he first held that the materials left by Moses were arranged by Ezra and the great synagogue; and afterwards, in his posthumous Introduction, he assigned this to the age of David. He notices two papers by another Roman Catholic writer, *Hug*, Beitrag zur Geschichte d. Sam. Pent., in the Freiburg Zeitschrift, Heft vii. 5, 1 ff., and Untersuchung ü. d. Alter d. Schreibkunst b. d. Hebräern, *ib.* Heft iv. 5, 1 ff. He also names *Sack*,

Christl. Apologetik, first edition, 1829, pp. 151–176] ; *Rosenmüller*, Scholia in Pent., P. i. ed. 3, 1821, Prolegg.: finally, more profoundly and more successfully, by *Hengstenberg*, Beitrr. vols. ii. and iii. (die Authentie des Pent. i. and ii.); by *Hävernick*, Einleit. i. 2, p. 13 ff.; by *König*, Alttestl. Studien, ii.; by *B. Welte*, Nachmosaisches; and by *Scholz*, Einl. ii. p. 35 ff. [Besides *Ranke*, already noticed among the writers on Introduction at the head of § 20, *Bleek*, p. 177, names *M. Drechsler*, die Einheit u. Echtheit d. Genesis, Hamburg 1838, already noticed in § 23, Note 6; and another production of his, die Unwissenschaftlichkeit im Gebiete d. alttestl. kritik belegt, taking up *v. Bohlen* and *Vatke* especially, Leipzig 1837. At p. 174 he notices that several of these books meet the objections to the historical credibility; and it is this subject that is chiefly treated in the work of *G. W. Meyer*, which will be noticed at § 37, Note 4; as, again, the legislation is the subject of *E. Fr. Stäudlin's* die Echtheit d. Mosaischen Gesetzes vertheidigt, in *Bertholdt's* krit. Journal, vol. iii. (1825), St. 3, 4, vol. iv. St. 1, 2. He also calls attention, p. 177, to a paper by *F. E. Movers*, ü. d. Auffindung d. Gesetzbuches unter Josia, in the Zeitschrift f. Philos. u. kathol. Theologie, Heft xii. 14 (1834–5).]

Delitzsch, die Genesis, i. pp. 24 ff., 37–8, has propounded an altogether peculiar view of the composition of the Pentateuch. Moses wrote down Deuteronomy in the presence of the children of Israel (Deut. xxxi.; Josh. viii. 32); on the contrary, the intermediate books expressly attribute to Moses only the recording of two series of laws, and the summary of the stations [at which they encamped]. By means of these testimonies, along with the observation of two currents of history running through the Pentateuch, he is conducted to the following representation:—"The kernel or first groundwork of the Pentateuch is the Book of the Covenant, written by Moses himself, now wrought up into the connected history of the legislation, Ex. xix.–xxiv. The rest of the laws in the wilderness of Sinai, and on to the plains of Moab, were published by Moses orally, but were recorded in the written form by the priests, whose business this was, Deut. xvii. 11, etc.," yet not necessarily during the journey through the wilderness. "It was on the soil of the Holy Land that the history of Israel, which had now reached one termination, began to be written; but to write the history of the Mosaic age it became necessary, of course, to take up, and so to record, the Mosaic legislation in its entire compass. A man like Eleazar, the son of Aaron the priest, wrote the whole work which begins with Gen. i. 1, into which he introduced the Book of the Covenant, and perhaps gave only a short account of the last addresses of Moses, since Moses had recorded these with his own

hand. Another, like Joshua or one of those elders upon whom the spirit of Moses rested, supplemented this work, and incorporated with it the whole of Deuteronomy, which indeed had been his own model." [*Bleek*, p. 181, notices that *J. H. Kurtz*, Gesch. d. alten Bundes, vol. ii. (1855), p. 531 ff., has attached himself to this hypothesis of Delitzsch, thinking that Moses did not write our Pentateuch, but in the intermediate books only those passages which are expressly said to have been written by him, and in Deuteronomy, ch. i.–xxxii.; yet also thinking that the composition took place partly under Moses, and partly under Joshua, or not long after. This peculiar view was noticed briefly in § 23, Note 7.]

§ 37. *Objections to the Genuineness of the Pentateuch.*

I. ITS UNHISTORICAL CHARACTER.—The following particulars are said to be proofs that the contents of the Pentateuch are unhistorical: —A. So many occurrences which contradict amazingly the laws of nature, and assume an immediate interference of the divine energy, and not a mere higher (theurgic) power of nature, such as might somehow be conceivable; B. The treatment of primeval history in the patriarchal and Mosaic periods, according to a religious-poetical-didactic plan; C. The slipping in of all sorts of blunders against historical truth, such as betray more recent narrators (1).

(1) So *De Wette*, Einl. § 145, 147, *b*, and 148. Similarly *Tuch*, *Ewald*, *v. Lengerke*, and all the Rationalist critics.

Of these three arguments, however, the first involves a *petitio principii* in dogma, which is valueless for criticism until the impossibility of miracles has been established. In this attempt Rationalism has not been successful hitherto, and it never will succeed. There cannot occur a divine revelation, such as the Pentateuch contains, without miracles, without the immediate interference of the living God in the development of that people to whose lot this revelation falls. The miracles wrought on and for Israel, which took place by the instrumentality of Moses, or under him, and which are recorded in the four last books of the Pentateuch, are as wide as the poles asunder from the myths and prodigies of heathenism. They are neither products of imaginative popular legends, nor empty fancies of religious-patriotic enthusiasm, but real doings of the Almighty Creator

and Ruler of nature and of the world of men; and thus they by no means exclude the testimony of the narrator as an eye-witness (2). However, it is true that the contents of Genesis are only in a small measure extracted from contemporaneous written records; for the most part they rest on oral tradition, transmitted first within the circle of the patriarchs, and then amongst the chosen race. Yet this tradition might the more easily be bequeathed by one generation to another pure and unadulterated, in proportion to the longevity of the patriarchs, their simple mode of life, and their isolation from all foreign influences. Besides, it carries the stamp of purest truth and historical value in the religious nature of its subject-matter, and in its pure moral spirit, as well as in its inartificial and sober style, and its child-like simplicity and objectivity (3).

The other two arguments are unfounded. Of course the theocratic plan of the Pentateuch is based upon the religious principle that the Old Testament is a revelation; and this principle is didactic, because its aim was to educate Israel to be the bearer of salvation for all nations. But it is not poetical (4) and unhistorical: on the contrary, it is strictly historical, teaching by facts, and verifying the doctrines by the doings. Finally, passages have nowhere been proved to be blunders against historical truth; for different [*i.e.* inconsistent] representations of the same thing do not occur, nor contradictions, properly speaking (§ 26); nor are the historical circumstances of the patriarchal and Mosaic times erroneously represented (5).

(2) *De Wette*, Einl. § 145, lays especial stress on this circumstance, in opposition to the historical apprehension of miracles, that there is a gradual diminution of the miraculous element in the historical books, till it entirely ceases: "Familiarity of man with God is reserved for primitive times; at a later time, it is only angels who appear; still later, the prophets are the bearers of the miraculous; and in the accounts of Ezra and Nehemiah, after the exile, this element is wholly awanting." This assertion is not true; and in so far as there is truth at the foundation of it, it is not convincing. God holds intercourse still with Abraham, as a man does with his friend (Gen. xviii.), after having revealed Himself to him earlier in prophetic vision (Gen xv.), and to Hagar by an angel (Gen. xvi. 7 ff). Also the Angel of the Lord still appears to Gideon (Judg. vi. 11 ff.), to Manoah (ch. xiii. 3 ff.), and to David (2 Sam. xxiv. 16, 17), though

God had already long been revealing His will by prophets; and the books of the latest prophets, Daniel and Zechariah, contain even divine revelations by the mediation of angels. Just as little does the miraculous decrease gradually. On the contrary, it comes forth at the beginning, in the middle, and towards the end, or at any great crisis in the theocracy, in an equally strong degree: at the time of its foundation, by Moses and Joshua; at the time when it lay in ruins in the kingdom of Israel, by Elijah and Elisha; and finally, during the exile, by Daniel. And these were periods in which the obscure and mythical light of primeval times had long given place to the clear light of history. The history in the Bible is distinguished essentially from that of all other nations (as animated by a peculiar spirit, the Spirit of God) just by this very thing, that we cannot apply to it the distinction which *Varro* makes of three successive ages: first, ἄδηλον; second, μυθικόν; and third, ἱστορικόν. Attention has been called to this already by *J. H. Pareau*, disput. de mythica S. C. interpretatione, Trajecti ad Rhenum 1824, p. 76 ff.; and his solid discussion has been entirely ignored, instead of being refuted, by modern criticism.

(3) Comp. *Häv.* i. 2, § 120 ff.; *Delitzsch*, d. Genesis, i. p. 45 ff.

(4) Least of all an epic, or "the theocratic epic of the Israelites" (*De Wette*, Beitrr. ii. p. 28 ff.; Einl. § 147, *b*). Against this opinion, comp. *G. W. Meyer*, Apologie der geschichtlichen Auffassung des Alten Test., bes. des Pent., Sulzburg 1811; *B. Welte*, Nachmosaisches, p. 53 ff.

(5) This follows from a closer consideration of the proof-passages produced by *De Wette*, Einl. § 148. As to Gen. xvii. 25 and xxi. 14, 15 (the age of Ishmael), comp. *Kurtz*, Gesch. des Alten Bund. i. pp. 201–2, 2d ed. 1853. [*Bleek*, p. 266, on this subject, also notices the beauty of Sarah, ch. xx., at an age when she could no longer have children; and the fact that Abraham had children by Keturah after Sarah's death. It is easy to reply that Keturah may have been a secondary wife at an earlier period of his history; or, though she were not so, the history suggests that a new lease of vital force, accompanied by the freshness and beauty which are natural to this, was given to Abraham and Sarah. He also speaks of a chronological difficulty in ch. xxx. 25, 26; while he admits that Luther had removed it by supposing that vers. 9–21, or thereby, referred to a later date, although recorded earlier.] The contradiction discovered by *v. Lengerke*, Kenaan, p. 302, between Gen. xxvii. 1, 2, and xxxv. 28, is quite unimportant; for there is nothing impossible nor incredible in Isaac's surviving forty-three years after becoming blind

and bedridden in his 137th year. As for Ex. xvi. 33, 34, and xl. 20 ff., comp. *Ranke*, ii. p. 36; as for Ex. xix. 22, 24, and xxiv. 5, and xxviii. xxix., comp. him again, p. 40 ff., 54 ff., and *M. Baumgarten* on these passages. As for Ex. xxxviii. 25, 26, and Num. i., comp. *Häv.* i. 2, p. 422 ff. The census which was appointed and executed in the second year of the exodus, of the whole congregation of Israel, according to their tribes and fathers' houses, with the number of the names of all the males, by their polls, and with an enrolment of all that were able to go forth to war (Num. i. 2, 3), is not inconsistent with the enumeration of the people six or seven months earlier for the purpose of taking a poll-tax (Ex. xxx. 12 ff., xxxviii. 25, 26), [not to say that the money might be advanced by willing men according to an approximate estimate, on the security of repayment from this poll-tax; and that even such repayment might cease to be requisite on account of the superabundance of free-will offerings, Ex. xxxvi. 5–7]. Finally, as to Lev. xxv. 32 and Num. xxxv., compare *Ranke*, ii. p. 114 ff.

§ 38.

II. THE TRACES OF AN AGE LATER THAN THAT OF MOSES.—The books of Moses are said to manifest that they are more recent productions, by several traces of the period subsequent to the Mosaic age (1), particularly—

1. "By the formula 'unto this day,' which occurs in other Hebrew historical books." But in Genesis this is said only of events which had taken place some centuries before the time of Moses (ch. xix. 37, 38, xxvi. 33, xxxii. 33, xxxv. 20, xlvii. 26); and in Deuteronomy, of occurrences already long past, or of a state of matters which had subsisted for a considerable time (2).

(1) These anachronisms are enumerated in *Vater*, iii. p. 631 ff.; *Hartmann*, Forsch. pp. 689, 690; *De Wette*, Einl. § 147, *a*, and § 148. They are refuted in *Hengstb.* iii. p. 179 ff.; *Welte*, Nachmos. p. 161 ff.

(2) Deut. ii. 22, of the expulsion of the Horites from Mount Edom by the children of Esau; x. 8, of the selection of the Levites for the holy service; xxix. 3, of the continuous hardening of the people's heart; iii. 14, of Jair calling the cities of Bashan after his own name, Havoth-jair, unto this day,—an event certainly in the last year of the march, but which did not by any means lie so near the point of time at which these speeches are dated as to prevent such a

remark from being made, considering that the greatest difficulty in preserving new names is precisely in the time immediately subsequent to their introduction. [This last is indeed the only case with the slightest appearance of difficulty; and it is ever to be remembered how the few months previous to the death of Moses had brought changes so rapid and so momentous, that the earliest of these seemed to belong to an entirely different epoch.] Comp. *Hengstb.* p. 325 ff.; *Welte*, p. 184. Finally, ch. xxxiv. 6 proves nothing, standing as it does in the appendix which was attached to the work of Moses after his death.

II. "By historical and antiquarian illustrations." But when these are rightly understood, they by no means presuppose the adoption of a point of view on the part of the author which is later than the times of Moses (3).

(3) *De Wette*, Einl. § 147, *a*, avails himself of the following passages:—Gen. xii. 6, xiii. 7, that "the Canaanites," or they and the Perizzites, "were then in the land;" that is, when Abraham came into the land promised by the Lord to him and his seed, he found it already peopled by various races, so that he could appropriate the divine promise only by faith. The expulsion of the Canaanites is not presupposed in this remark; comp. *Hengstb.* pp. 185–6.—Gen. xiv. 2, 8, "Bela, which is Zoar;" xiv. 7, "En-mishpat, which is Kadesh;" ver. 17, "the valley of Shaveh, which is the king's dale;" xxiii. 2, "Kirjath-arba, the same is Hebron;" xxxv. 19, "Ephrath, which is Bethlehem." But all these names in later use had either originated long before Moses, or did so in his time: see, as to Zoar, Gen. xix. 17, 21. As to Kadesh, see ch. xvi. 14, xx. 1, Num. xx. 14, 16, etc. The origin of this name is quite unknown; so is that of the king's dale, unless perhaps it is to be sought in the circumstance related in Gen. xiv. 17 (comp. *Thenius* on 2 Sam. xviii. 18), and also that of Bethlehem. As for Kirjath-arba and Hebron, the latter is truly the older and the original name (Gen. xiii. 18); and Kirjath-arba was first introduced in the period between Abraham and Moses, till again it was set aside after the Israelites had taken the city, Josh. xiv. 15; comp. *Keil* on this passage, and *Hengstb.* p. 187 ff. [*J. H. Arnold* notices that if the Mohammedans were out of the way, no doubt their name for this city, El Chalil, would in like manner disappear before the older one: he thinks, however, that Mamre was the oldest name of all.]—Ex. xvi. 36, "Now an omer is the tenth part of an ephah." An omer, however, is not the designation of a measure which afterwards came to be disused; but it is a bowl or pitcher, of a determinate

size, whose relation to the ephah is given on purpose to determine more precisely the quantity of manna which was gathered; comp. *Hengstb.* p. 218 ff.—Finally, as for Deut. iii. 5, "All these cities [of the kingdom of Bashan] were fenced with high walls, gates, and bars;" ver. 9, "Which Hermon the Sidonians call Sirion, and the Amorites call it Shenir;" and ver. 11, the notice of Og's bedstead of iron. None of these notices bring us to a period subsequent to Moses. The first two are explained by the novelty of the subject-matter (comp. as to these cities the remarks of *K. v. Raumer*, Palæstina, p. 63, 3d ed., [and more recently Professor *Porter's* Bashan's Giant Cities, London 1865]); and the last by the aim of Moses, to give a vivid representation of the greatness of the conquered foe, and consequently of the greatness of the grace of God, which had vouchsafed the victory (comp. *Hengstb.* p. 237 ff.).

III. "By references to ancient authorities, Num. xxi. 14, 17, 27." But there is nothing said here of their being *ancient*. The Book of the Wars of the Lord (ver. 14) is a collection of songs made during the march of the Israelites through the wilderness, in which were celebrated the great things which God had done against the enemies of Israel; and the verses extracted from it are not intended to verify the accuracy of geographical notices: they simply re-echo the impression which the great deeds of Jehovah made upon the congregation of Israel (4).

(4) Comp. *Hengstb.* iii. p. 223 ff.

IV. "By the fact that the writer's point of view, locally, is Palestine." An unfounded assumption. The use of "the sea" in the sense of "the west," Gen. xii. 8, Ex. xxvi. 22, etc., is quite conceivable from Arabia, or from the land of Moab [*J. H. Arnold* says, even from northern Egypt, especially since it comprehends a "north-west wind"]; without taking this into account, that the geographical designations for the cardinal points might have been already fixed for the Hebrew language by the patriarchs. And the use of the expression "beyond Jordan"—now for Western Canaan (Num. xxxii. 19), and now for Peræa on the east, as in Gen. l. 10, Num. xxii. 1—is to be explained thus, that in the times when the Israelites were not yet in Canaan, or were no longer there, there sprang up an ideal usage of language in addition to the objective geographical one. In conse-

quence, an author assumes an ideal point of view, independently of his actual position; so that either of the sides of Jordan may be designated as beyond it (5).

(5) See my Commentaries on Kings, p. 56, note 2, compared with *Hengstb.* Beitrr. iii. p. 313 ff., and *M. Drechsler*, die Unwissenschaftlichkeit im Geb. d. alttestl. Krit. p. 148 ff.; *Häv.* i. 2, p. 33 f.

v. "By the treatment of the Mosaic history, even the most recent, as that which is past long ago (Deut. i.–iii., especially iii. 4, 8, 15, 18, 29)." No. What took place before the eleventh month of the fortieth year of the march is represented as past, but by no means as *long* past (6).

(6) Only Deut. ii. 10–12 and 20–23 refer to events which happened long before Moses, partly hundreds of years before, and interrupt the thread of the discourse, as do the notices in iii. 9–11; yet these are not in consequence to be pronounced later than Moses (comp. Note 2): they are insertions made by Moses himself when he set down his discourses in writing. Still less does a later point of view betray itself in Num. xv. 22, 23, and xxviii. 6, as *v. Lengerke* and *De Wette* suppose.

VI. "By some later state of matters being presupposed." This, however, does not lie in the text: it has first been introduced into individual passages by erroneous interpretations or assumptions (7).

(7) In Lev. xviii. 28 the expulsion of the Canaanites is said to be presupposed. But the warning, "Defile not ye yourselves, . . . that the land spue not you out also, when ye defile it, *as it spued out the nations that were before you*," cannot possibly be understood of the expulsion of the Canaanites as a completed event, since at ver. 24 the participle is used—literally, "which I *am* casting out," [as the judgment had already overtaken the eastern Canaanites before Moses completed his book. *J. H. Arnold* lays stress upon the use of the singular, "the nation," ver. 28, not "the nations," as at ver. 24, and applies this to the Sodomites; and he takes "before you" in a geographical sense, which is common]. The figure of speech merely intimates that the inhabitants of the land had already come under sentence of extermination, that they could no longer be tolerated in the land on account of their abominations. As to Deut. ii. 12, see § 31, Note 2.—The passages, Ex. xxii. 20, xxiii. 9, "Ye were strangers

in the land of Egypt," have nothing to do here, as the Israelites had been already redeemed from the land of Egypt at the date of the legislation.—In Ex. xxiii. 19, "The first of the first-fruits of thy land thou shalt bring into *the house* of the Lord thy God," there is just as little a presupposition of Solomon's temple as there is an allusion to the temple-mount in Ex. xv. 17, "Thou shalt bring them in and plant them in *the mountain* of thine inheritance, in the place, O Lord, which Thou hast made for Thee to dwell in." For the whole people could not possibly be planted on the temple-mount; so we must understand Canaan by "the mountain of thine inheritance," like "that goodly mountain," Deut. iii. 25, and "this mountain," in parallelism with "the border of His sanctuary," or "His holy border," Ps. lxxviii. 54 (in opposition to *Hengstb.* on this text, compare *Aben Ezra* and *Rosenmüller* on Ex. xv. 17), although a prophetic allusion to the place Moriah, which had been sanctified by the offering of Isaac, might also not lie beyond Moses' field of vision.—In Gen. xl. 15, Joseph's words, "I was stolen away out of the land of the *Hebrews*," do not presuppose the occupation of Canaan by the Israelites, or its transformation into a Hebrew country.—There is more plausibility about Gen. xxxvi. 31, "These are the kings that reigned in the land of Edom, before there reigned any king over the children of Israel." Yet, considering that the text refers to preceding promises granted to Abraham and Jacob, that kings should be of them, and should come out of their loins (Gen. xvii. 6, 16, xxxv. 11, especially the last), it follows from the words of this text, not that Israel already had a king when they were written, but only that the writer was firmly persuaded Israel was to have kings, and that Edom had had kings prior to the fulfilment in Israel of the promise given to the patriarchs. See *Delitzsch* on this passage, and *Hengstb.* p. 202 ff.—The remaining passages adduced in proof are of a prophetic nature: either threats that Israel should be thrust out from the presence of Jehovah, and scattered among the heathen in punishment of their apostasy (Lev. xxvi. 3-45; Deut. xxix. 7, xxxii. 5-33 [? xxviii.-xxxiii.]), which Moses might perfectly well utter (compare *Hengstb.* p. 330 ff.); or prophecies of a different kind, in which *vaticinia ex eventu*, and allusions and references to later special historical occurrences, can be discovered only by perverted exposition. Thus, in the prophetic determination of boundaries, Gen. xv. 18, Ex. xxiii. 31, a reference has been found to David's extension of the kingdom of Israel to the Euphrates, while ignoring the fact that he never extended his southern limit to the Nile (see above, § 26, Note 1); in Gen. xxvii. 40 ("By thy sword shalt thou live, and shalt serve thy brother: and it shall come to pass, when thou shalt have

the dominion, that thou shalt break his yoke from off thy neck"), a reference to the revolt of Edom from Judah under Joram, 2 Kings viii. 20, against which compare *Hengstb.* pp. 296–7; in Num. xxiv. 7, the mention of Saul's victory over the Amalekite king Agag (1 Sam. xv. 2 ff.); *ibid.* vers. 17–19, compared with Gen. xxv. 23 and xxvii. 29, an allusion to David's victory over the Edomites and Moabites, and in ver. 20 ff. a reference to Assyria. In these remarks due weight has not been given to the facts, that Agag (Num. xxiv. 7) is a name of dignity for all the Amalekite kings; and that Balaam's prophetic utterances in general are mere individualizing pictures of the election of Israel, and of their victory over the world, which is represented by the nations hostile [in his day] to the theocracy—the Amalekites, the Moabites, the Edomites, and the Kenites. Comp. *Hengstb.* p. 306 ff., 294 ff., and Gesch. des Bileam, p. 148 ff., 160 ff.

VII. "By the mention of names of places and of countries which were known and in common use only at a later time, and in consequence of later usage and custom were thrown back into the earlier ages." But an origin posterior to the age of Moses cannot actually be evinced from the names *Hebron, Bethel, Dan,* and *Havoth-jair* (8); nor yet from the "later" usages and customs which are alleged to be thus thrown back into antiquity in the book of Genesis (9).

(8) As to Hebron, comp. Note 3.—*Luz,* again, obtained the name of *Bethel* so far back as from Jacob (Gen. xxviii. 19, xxxv. 15), so that it stands in Gen. xii. 8, xiii. 3, only proleptically; though the old name Luz remained in use among the Canaanites, and was not thoroughly displaced until the Israelites took possession of the land, Judg. i. 23: comp. my comm. on Josh. xvi. 2.—It is true that the place *Leshem,* or *Laish,* did not receive the name of *Dan* till after the death [?] of Joshua, being so named by the Danites who conquered it (Josh. xix. 47; Judg. xviii. 29). But it remains very questionable whether this be the Dan mentioned in Gen. xiv. 14 and Deut. xxxiv. 1, since there is also a *Dan-Jaan* in the north of Palestine, which is mentioned in 2 Sam. xxiv. 6 (comp. *Hengstb.* p. 194); and this can be set aside only by arbitrary changes in the text, such as *Dan-Laish* by *Thenius,* and, quite unsuitably, Dan-in-the-wood (הַיָּעַר) by *v. Lengerke,* p. 189.—*Havoth-jair* ("Jair's lives") was the name given by Jair the Manassite to the towns of the region of Argob which he had conquered under Moses, Num. xxxii. 41 and Deut. iii. 14 and 4. With this Judg. x. 4 does not in the least conflict, that the judge Jair from Gilead "had thirty sons, ... and they had thirty cities,

which are called Havoth-jair to this day," since it is not said here that they first received this name from the sons of Jair (comp. *Bertheau* on Judg. x. 4); although it is not in itself so entirely improbable that the old name acquired new significance through this second Jair. —With reference to the remaining difficulties discovered in the various accounts of Havoth-jair in the Old Testament, comp. *Hengstb.* p. 224 ff., and *my* commentary on 1 Kings iv. 13.

(9) *De Wette* (Einl. p. 148) finds instances of later usages and customs carried back into antiquity in various passages of Genesis. In ch. iv. 3, 4; comp. Lev. ii. 14, iii. 3, and Num. xv. 20. But even though the offerings of Cain and Abel were wholly Levitical, the transference of these Levitical regulations to primitive antiquity could prove nothing against the Mosaic composition of Genesis, since the Levitical regulations for sacrifice were not a new invention by Moses, but in their points of most essential moment rested upon ancient practice; and yet the designation of the sacrifice of the firstlings of the flock (the slaughtered or the burnt offering) as מִנְחָה is just as little Levitical as a מִנְחָה מִפְּרִי הָאֲדָמָה (Gen iv. 3, 4).—Again, in iv. 14, xvii. 26, and other places. But is it then so, that to hide oneself from the face of Jehovah, to be a fugitive in the earth, to build a city, to call upon the name of Jehovah, or to distinguish between clean and unclean animals, to offer burnt-offerings upon an altar, and to inquire at Jehovah (vii. 8, viii. 20, xxv. 22), first came to be practised in the time of Moses, or later than Moses? Or is the wearing of golden rings and bracelets (xxiv. 22, 30), and of tunics with long sleeves (xxxvii. 3, 23 [in the English and in other versions, coats of many colours]), an invention of the age of Moses, or later still, because these tunics continued to be worn as upper robes by the unmarried daughters of the king even in David's time, and afterwards went out of fashion (2 Sam. xiii. 18)?—Finally, where in Num. xxii.–xxiv. is Balaam designated the *prophet* (נָבִיא) of Jehovah, to the injury consequently of the historical colouring? On the character of Balaam, comp. *Hengstb.* Bileam, p. 5 ff.

Thus all the allegations that there are traces of a later age, and errors against historical truth, make it manifest of themselves that they are without foundation. And the fact that nothing which can on good grounds be assigned to an age later than Moses, occurs in a work of so considerable extent, furnishes a very weighty testimony in favour of the genuineness of the entire book.

§ 39.

III. Remaining General Objections.—For a time an argument against the genuineness of the Pentateuch was constructed from the limited diffusion of the art of writing among the Hebrews in the age of Moses; in very recent times, however, this has been given up again as untenable (1). Also the *assertion* no longer passes current as a *fact*, that "the language of the Pentateuch perfectly coincides with that of the rest of the older historical books; and the language of its poetical sections with that of the rest of the poetical pieces of the first age of the language." There is now merely the question raised, whether it is probable that the Hebrew language altered so little in a period of about a thousand years, as is shown by the difference between the style of the Pentateuch and that of the remaining books of the Old Testament, even the latest. Along with this, it is affirmed to be "senseless to admit that one man formed beforehand the epic-historical style, the rhetorical, and the poetical, in their whole extent; nay, so far as concerns the spirit and subject-matter of these three departments of Hebrew literature, filled them up so as to leave nothing for any subsequent author, but to become his follower." But nothing so "senseless" is affirmed by any defender of the Pentateuch; nor has it any foundation in the Pentateuch itself. Along with highly cultivated prose, it certainly furnishes also lofty productions in poetry and in rhetorico-prophetical diction, which bear testimony to the creative genius of Moses. But yet they do not by any means exhaust the poetical and prophetical domain of Hebrew literature; and in subject-matter and form, they are not so complete as to leave merely the name of Moses' followers to the later poets and prophets. On the contrary, as the historical development of this branch of the literature shows (§ 5–7), they have still left room enough for subsequent ages to cultivate and perfect it. Also the difference between the language of the books of Moses on the one side, and on the other of the writings of the age of David and Solomon, and of the writings of the older prophets, is as great as one could ever expect, considering the peculiar structure of the Shemitic languages and the historical relations of the Israelites (§ 14–16).

(1) The manner in which this point was handled, together with a refutation of this argument, may be learned from *Hengstb.* Beittr. ii. p. 415 ff.

(2) Comp. *Gesenius*, Geschichte d. hebr. Sprache, pp. 19, 20, 31; and *De Wette*, Einl. § 163, p. 204.

Finally, the argument that the Mosaic legislation appears to be so slighted in its weightiest laws during the period of the judges, that the worship of Jehovah first attained to stability and cultivation in the time of David and Solomon, and that the liberty to honour Jehovah at a variety of holy places was first abolished by Josiah's reformation of worship; all this rests, not upon historical facts, but upon arbitrary suppositions and false inferences from individual passages in the other historical books (3). The first cultivation of the worship of Jehovah is not due to David and Solomon; but much earlier, Joshua had adjusted the whole arrangements of the state according to the rule of the Mosaic law, which remained the rule and the standard for the religious, civil, and domestic life of the Israelites, even in those saddest times of that period of the judges, in which the bands of the theocracy were loosened and many a time torn asunder by the wide-spreading apostasy of the people (§ 34, Note 3), so that the reforming agency of Samuel could lead back the entire people again to become faithful to Jehovah and His law (1 Sam. vii. 3 ff.). David merely strengthened and confirmed the theocratic spirit which Samuel had wakened up, by composing his Psalms, and by the arrangements which he had made for setting up the Levitical service; and Solomon completed this by the temple buildings which he erected. Yet all this was insufficient to banish entirely and for ever from the heart of the sensuous people their inclination to other gods; above all, as even Solomon in his old age allowed himself to be seduced into idolatry. Consequently, after the division of the kingdom, idolatry and worship at high places spread immediately and wonderfully; nor could even the pious kings Jehoshaphat, Hezekiah, and Josiah, extirpate them abidingly, until, finally, the severe sufferings of the exile took away entirely from the people all desire and love for the gods of the heathen (4).

(3) An especial instance of the false assumptions is that of the

late origin and unhistorical character of the book of Joshua: an instance of the false inferences, is the conclusion that the book of the law did not exist at the time mentioned in 1 Sam. x. 25, xv. 2, 3, 1 Kings viii. 4, because it is not mentioned there.

(4) From the continuance of high places, and the offerings made upon them, subsequent to the building of Solomon's temple, it does not follow that liberty to honour Jehovah at a variety of holy places still existed; but merely that the law which required men to bring their sacrifices only to the one place of the sanctuary which Jehovah should choose, was so often transgressed, that even the more pious kings were unable wholly to prevent this (comp. *my* comment. on 1 Kings xiv. 15, and my Apolog. Versuch üb. die Chronik, p. 20). The fact that gross idolatry entirely ceased amongst the Jews after the exile, only proves that the punishment of the exile was not fruitless. And the rise of a practice of precisely following the external letter of the law is easily explained by this, that the priests in the newly founded state, partly owing to their disproportionately large numbers (of 42,360 who returned under Zerubbabel, not fewer than 4289 were priests), partly owing to their position as the bearers of the theocratic principle in opposition to the heathen rulers of the land, were placed in circumstances to form a hierarchy which should guide and rule the popular mind, such as never could arise before the exile. Comp. *Hengst.* Beittr. iii. p. 8 ff.

SECOND DIVISION.

THE PROPHETICAL WRITINGS (נְבִיאִים).

CHAPTER I.

THE PROPHETICAL HISTORICAL BOOKS.

§ 40. *Peculiarity of the Historical Books composed by the Prophets.*

THE Israelite state formed a theocracy, in which God ruled as Sovereign, and so directed and guided the development of popular and national life, by means of human organs of His will, whom He called, and whom He furnished with the extraordinary powers that were requisite for the discharge of their office, as to ensure the attainment of its object; and this in spite of checks and disturbances arising out of the sin and the unfaithfulness of men. Hence genuine historical composition among the Israelites was animated by the spirit of the theocracy, and was borne up by the theocratic principle, as by that fresh fountain of life which pervades and fertilizes the history of this people (1). In order to educate Israel for its destiny, and to conduct it to the attainment of the object of its calling, not merely did God trace out before it the complete problem of its life in the law given by Moses; but at the same time He also revealed by word and act the consequences of faithfulness to His holy commands, and of the contrary: so that the entire subsequent history of the chosen people merely unfolds the historical realization of the divine plan traced out beforehand in the law.

(1) The *name* theocracy, as descriptive of the Israelite constitution in contrast with those of other nations, was first introduced by *Josephus*, c. Ap. ii. 16; but the way had been prepared for the *thing* itself—God's rule over Israel as His own state and people—so early as

the call of Abraham; and it was actually established by God's covenant with the twelve tribes at Sinai, and by the legislation connected with that covenant.

Agreeably to this, the highest problem of theocratic narrative consisted in conceiving the history of Israel in the light of the divine plan of salvation, and in representing distinctly and lucidly, in the historical development of the people and the kingdom, the covenant faithfulness of the just and gracious God as He led and guided His people, together with their continually changing relations as they were seduced by sin into unfaithfulness to their God. For in this manner the history was to be a mirror for the time then present, and for all time coming: in which Israel might observe how its unfaithfulness and apostasy from the Lord was the sole cause of its misfortunes; and how, on the contrary, prosperity and salvation were to be found only in faithful adherence to the ever faithful covenant God, and to His revealed word.

This theocratic principle (2), as it is manifestly and determinately stamped upon the Pentateuch, conditions and governs the matter and the form of those historical works which were composed by prophets, according to the testimony of tradition, confirmed as this is by the prophetic conception of the history which predominates in them (3).

(2) This is quite unsuitably named "theocratic pragmatism" by the modern criticism, in accordance with the representation introduced by Rationalism, that the theocracy rests upon a mere fancy of the Hebrew nation, destitute of objective truth and reality; as, for instance, *Bertholdt*, Einl. iii. p. 748 ff., has openly asserted. Nor can the theory as to the sources of Israelite history, which *Ewald* has spun out to a great length (Gesch. d. Volks Israel, i. p. 15 ff.), rise above this most paltry and narrow representation.

(3) In § 6 and § 7 the connection has been developed between the calling of the prophets and the composition of the history of the theocracy.

In conformity with what has been now said, only those facts, events, and persons can be objects of history, so far as the *matter* is concerned, that helped or hindered the course of theocratic development. The foreground is therefore occupied by the revelations of God in acts and words (miracles and predictions); alongside of which

there are circumstantial representations of those critical moments in the life of the people, and of its most prominent members, as throw light upon the attitude of the collective nation, or the principal individuals, in relation to the Lord and His kingdom. All other events, such as all the efforts of the people to perfect trades, arts, and sciences, also domestic, municipal, and political arrangements, are either passed over entirely, or are intimated briefly, and only in so far as they stand in connection with the higher aims of the theocracy.

Again, in correspondence with what has been said, the natural causes of events and the earthly motives which exerted an influence upon the conduct of historical personages are nowhere especially put forward, but at the utmost they are lightly touched upon. Instead of this, the influences and operations of the divine causality, as often as it manifested itself in an extraordinary or miraculous manner, and the divine motives and purposes, in so far as these were made manifest through the prophets, or other explanations of the will of God, are carefully mentioned (4).

Further, this explains two things: the apparent disproportion in the treatment of the historical matter,—some subjects being described at great length, while others are handled very summarily; and in the times of the kingdom, the brevity with which extracts are made from annalistic and prophetic works that have been full of details,—these extracts having been incorporated with the Canon of the Old Testament, whilst the larger works have perished (comp. § 54 and § 59). We must explain these phenomena, not at one time by the wealth and at another by the poverty of accessible historical materials, but much more by their value and importance for the theocratic ends of the narrative.

Finally, we trace to their source in the same principle the great correspondence of all the prophetical books of history in plan and mode of representation, and their mutual close connection, on which account they have been often explained to be the work of one final editor (5); and also the fact that the individuality of the writers retreats entirely out of view, connected as this is with the external circumstance that the books were given to their contemporaries anonymously, and have been so handed down to later ages; since the great acts of God in the history themselves furnish the most con-

clusive evidence for the truth and fidelity of the historical conception and representation (6).

Again, with reference to the *form* of the prophetic books of history, in common with the whole body of Shemitic historical compositions, their mode of representation is extremely simple and natural: their narrative is circumstantial, somewhat verbose, and even occasionally diffuse, in consequence of which they have not been afraid of smaller and larger repetitions; and there is a want of a formal combination of the different occurrences by means of various transitions and easy turns, instead of which certain more or less stereotyped closing formulas and superscriptions rather separate than combine the sections (7). On the contrary, they are essentially distinguished from the historical compositions of other nations by the greater objectivity of the narrative, unmingled with subjective judgments of approval or disapproval; so that, for the most part, the judgment passed upon the good and the evil conduct of the historical characters is left to be gathered solely from the consequences. Only in the books of Kings the actions and conduct of the rulers are judged by the standard of the divine law, and the spirit of their administration is characterized by certain standing formulas.

(4) When the modern criticism, from *Eichhorn* down to *Ewald*, rejects as a myth every immediate or supernatural interposition of God in the history of Israel, it merely brings to light its entanglement in the dogmatic prejudices, that there is no supernatural divine revelation, nor any free agency in the divine operations on living nature and on the lives of men, nor any predictions springing from divine enlightenment; and along with this, its incapacity for genuine historical criticism. On the manner in which this criticism, which is a stranger to real liberty, has been conducted, see *Delitzsch*, Genesis, i. p. 45 f.

(5) At an early period by *B. Spinoza;* and again of late by *Stähelin*, krit. Unterss. üb. d. Pent. p. 1; *Bertheau*, d. B. der Richter, p. xxvii.; partly also by *Ewald*, Gesch. i. p. 80 ff., who assumes two final editors,—one for the Pentateuch and the book of Joshua, and one for the books of Judges, Ruth, Samuel, and Kings.

(6) *Ewald* (Gesch. i. p. 75) also has noticed the absence of the authors' names as a peculiarity of the Hebrew books of history, distinguishing them as well from the Greek as from the Arabian (especially the Mohammedan) histories. But he erroneously points it

out as a defect, from which they did not become entirely free even in later times; because, agreeably to his merely subjective mode of viewing things, he seeks for the reason of it exclusively in this, that the histories which the narrator wished to fetter by a written form, appeared to him originally so great and so firmly established, that he himself seemed to stand in the background, and to vanish away before them.

(7) A rich collection of proofs, both from the Old Testament and from Arabian and Syrian histories, is given by *Ewald*, Komposition der Genesis, p. 125 ff.

THE INDIVIDUAL PROPHETICAL HISTORICAL BOOKS (נְבִיאִים רִאשׁוֹנִים).

THE BOOK OF JOSHUA (יְהוֹשֻׁעַ).

Commentaries: — *Nic. Serarius*, *Bonfrerius*, *Calvin*, *Brentius*, *Chytræus*, *Seb. Schmidt*, *J. A. Osiander*, *Drusius*, *Clericus*, *Rosenmüller*, etc.; see § 224 sq. Josuæ Imp. historia illustr. ab *Andr. Masio*, Antwerp. 1574, fol. *F. J. V. D. Maurer*, Comm. ü. d. B. Josua, Stuttgart 1831. *K. F. Keil*, Comm. ü. d. B. Josua, Erlangen 1847 [also his commentary on this book in *Keil and Delitzsch*, Commentary on the Old Testament; and *Knobel's* in the Kurzgefasst. Exeget. Handbuch. *Bush*, Notes on Joshua and Judges, reprinted from the American edition, 1838, by Ward, London.]

For Introduction:—*L. König*, Alttestl. Studien, Heft i., Meurs, 1836.

§ 41. *Name, Contents, and Object.*

The book takes its name from Joshua, who led the people of Israel into the land of Canaan, which had been promised to the patriarchs; for he was ordained by the Lord to be the successor of Moses. Connecting itself with the death of Moses, it relates the history of the conquest achieved by Joshua by the aid of Jehovah, and of the partition of Canaan among the twelve tribes, in accordance with the divine directions given through Moses; together with those things which Joshua continued to do till he died, in order to settle and strengthen the theocracy (1).

(1) Plainly the contents fall to be arranged under two divisions: —I. Ch. i.–xii., the history of the conquest of Canaan. 1. Preparations for it: (*a*) Call of Joshua to the work, command issued to the twelve tribes to make ready, mission of the spies, ch. i.; (*b*) decamping from Shittim, passage of Jordan, encampment at Gilgal, together with the circumcision of the people and the observance of the passover, ch. ii.–v. 12. 2. Commencement of the conquest: (*a*) Encouragement of Joshua by an [rather, *the*] Angel, and capture of Jericho; (*b*) obstacle at Ai through Achan's transgression, conquest of this city, and the setting up of the law upon Mount Ebal, ch. v. 13–viii. 3. Continuation of the conquest, the cunning of the Gibeonites, and their fate, ch. ix.; victory over the allied Canaanite kings at Gibeon, and occupation of the southern country, ch. x.; victory over the northern Canaanites, ch. xi. 4. List of the vanquished kings of Canaan, ch. xii. II. Ch. xiii.–xxiv., the history of the partition of the land. 1. Introductory, the divine command to do this, and the account of the portions of the land not yet occupied, and of the territory beyond Jordan, already given by Moses to the two tribes and a half, ch. xiii. 2. Beginning of the partition: (*a*) Inheritance of Caleb, ch. xiv.; (*b*) territory of Judah, ch. xv., and of Joseph, ch. xvi. xvii. 3. The partition continued at Shiloh: (*a*) Specification of the remaining land, ch. xviii. 1–9; (*b*) inheritance of Benjamin, vers. 10–28, of Simeon, Zebulun, Issachar, Asher, Naphtali, and Dan, ch. xix.; (*c*) appointment of the cities of refuge and of the Levitical cities, ch. xx. xxi.; (*d*) discharge of the tribes settled beyond Jordan, ch. xxii. 4. Completion of the work by Joshua's last words to the people; his death, and that of Eleazar, ch. xxiii. xxiv.

The *object* of the book is to magnify the inviolable covenant faithfulness of Jehovah in the fulfilment of His promises, ch. xxi. 43–45, by the historical information as to the conquest by the covenant people of the land of Canaan promised to their fathers, and their inheritance of it, ch. i. 2–6, through the almighty assistance of Jehovah, under the guidance of Joshua, Moses' minister, who had been called to effect the accomplishment of the divine promise, according to an appointment recorded in the law itself, Deut. xxxi. 7 (2).

(2) Comp. *Tholuck*, litt. Anzeiger 1839, No. 35, p. 274 f., and *Keil* in *Rudelbach and Guericke's* Zeitschrift f. Luther. Theol. 1846, i. p. 25 ff.—The object is determined erroneously by *Studer*, Comm. z. Buch d. Richter, p. 6; by *Bertheau*, d. B. d. Richter, p. 4; and by

Ewald, Geschichte, ii. p. 257. Comp. on the contrary, *Stähelin* in Theol. Studien u. Krit. 1849, p. 389 ff.

§ 42. *Independence of the Book.*

The contents of the book of Joshua certainly bring it into very close connection with the Pentateuch, since in the conquest and partition of Canaan Joshua is for the most part carrying out the regulations and commands of Moses (1); yet at no time was it bound together with the Law into one single book (2). On the contrary, there is internal evidence of its independent character, both in its contents, which are rounded off and complete in themselves (3), and in its peculiarities of language, diverging from that of the Pentateuch (4).

(1) Mosaic regulations are carried out, in ch. i. 13 ff., from Num. xxxii. 17 ff. and Deut iii. 18, 20; in viii. 29 and x. 26, from Deut. xxi. 23; in viii. 30 ff., from Deut. xxvii. 2–8; in xiv. 6 ff., from Num. xiv. 24, 30; in xx., from Num. xxxv. 9–28 and Deut. xix. 1–13; in xxi., from Num. xxxv. 2–8.—A dependence on the Pentateuch is manifested especially in i. 2–9, on Deut. xxxi. 3, 5–8, 23; in i. 3, 4, on Deut. xi. 24; in ii. 11, on Deut. iv. 39; in v. 13, on Num. xxii. 23; in v. 15, on Ex. iii. 5; in x. 8, on Num. xxi. 34; finally, xxiv. 2 ff. is full of references and verbal allusions to the Pentateuch (see *my* commentary on this chapter).—Related passages are: xii. 2–6 and xiii. 2–5 with Num. xxi. 21 ff., 33 ff., Deut. ii. 31 ff., iii. 1 ff., iv. 46 ff.; xiii. 29–31 with Deut. iii. 13–15; xx. 8 with Deut. iv. 41–43.

(2) So *Bleek* asserted in *Rosenmüller*, Rep. i. 46 f. [and in his Einleitung, pp. 311–12, where he says that the death of Moses is a resting-point, but not a point for satisfactorily terminating the history; this opinion being a consequence of his own erroneous conception of the Pentateuch, which is the history and legislation of Moses as the mediator of the old covenant. At pp. 322, 644, *Bleek* declares it probable that the book of Joshua did not exist as a clearly separate book till the time of Ezra], and *Ewald* in Theol. Studien u. Krit. 1831, p. 602 ff.; followed by *Stähelin* (Studien u. Krit. 1835, p. 472, and krit. Unterss. üb. d. Pent. p. 93 f.), *Tuch* (Genesis, p. li. ff.), *De Wette* (Einl. § 168, comp. § 165), *v. Lengerke*, p. lxxxiii. f., etc. Against this view, see above, § 32 at the end, and *my* Commentary on Joshua, p. xxiv. ff. [*Vaihinger*, in *Herzog's* Encycl. art. Pentateuch,

pp. 293–4, takes the same view as *Keil*, while noticing the close connection between the book of Joshua and the Pentateuch; and he thinks this is confirmed by the Samaritans having a separate book of Joshua, of which some account is given below in § 215, Note 1.]

(3) Not to speak of the internal unity of the book (§ 43), it manifests its own independence by adopting and inserting in full the account of the conquest and partition by Moses of the country beyond Jordan eastward, and of his appointment of the cities of refuge there, so as to present a complete view of the occupation and partition of the land.

(4) The book of Joshua has no longer any knowledge of the archaisms which pervade the five books of Moses equally (§ 15, Note 2); and in spite of its greater linguistic agreement with the Pentateuch, conditioned by their common subject-matter (§ 15, Notes 3–5), it has many expressions and forms which deviate from the Pentateuch, and are unknown to it. Such are the constant spelling (twenty-six times in all) יְרִיחוֹ, ii. 1–3, etc., instead of יְרֵחוֹ, Num. xxii. 1, xxvi. 3, 63, etc. (eleven times in all in the Pentateuch); the word for the kingdom of Sihon, or of Og, is מַמְלְכוּת, xiii. 12, 21, 27, 30, 31, instead of מַמְלָכָה, Num. xxxii. 33, Deut. iii. 4, 10, 13; קְנוֹא, xxiv. 19, instead of קַנָּא, Ex. xx. 5, xxxiv. 14, Deut. iv. 24, v. 9, vi. 15; דָּמוֹ בְרֹאשׁוֹ, ii. 19, instead of דָּמָיו בּוֹ, Lev. xx. 9, 11–13, 16; Jehovah "the Lord of all the earth," iii. 11, 13; "the treasury of Jehovah," or "of the house of Jehovah," vi. 19, 24; and other words already adduced in § 16, Note 1.

§ 43. *Unity of the Book.*

The various hypotheses propounded in opposition to the unity of the Pentateuch have been applied likewise to the book of Joshua; and sometimes men have asserted that in its nature it is fragmentary, sometimes that an original document has assumed the form of the present book owing to subsequent enlargement by extensive interpolations (1). However, the book contains no traces of fragments, nor of contradictions in reference to facts (2), nor of differences in mode of thinking or expression, to justify hypotheses of this kind (3); but it is closely connected in all its parts, and pervaded and governed by one and the same idea, so that neither its original nor its actual unity is exposed to any well-founded doubts (4).

(1) Badly connected fragments and contradictions were discovered

by *Nachtigal*, in *Henke's* Magazin, iv. 2, p. 362 ff., and in *Eichhorn*, allgem. Biblioth. iv. p. 1088 ff.; by *Bertholdt*, Einleitung, iii. p. 849 ff.; by *Meyer*, über die Bestandtheile u. Œconomie des B. Josua, in *Ammon* u. *Bertholdt*, krit. Journ. ii. p. 337 ff.; by *Eichhorn*, Einl. iii. p. 382 ff.; by *Paulus*, in his Theol. ex. Conserv. ii. 149 ff.; by *De Wette*, Einl., first four editions; by *C. R. v. Herverden*, disputatio de libro Josuæ, Groningæ 1826, [who discovers ten documents in it, according to *Bleek*, p. 325]; and partly also by *Maurer*, Comment. p. xiii. f.; and by *G. A. Hauff*, Offenbarungsglaube u. Kritik der bibl. Geschichtsb., Stuttgart 1843.—On the contrary, the unity was defended by *König*, alttestl. Studien, p. 3 ff.; *Steudel*, Vorlesungen üb. die Theol. des Alten Test., Beilage, p. 442 ff.; and *Häv.* Einl. ii. 1, p. 12 ff.—The hypothesis of supplements was transferred from the Pentateuch to Joshua, and carried out by *Stähelin*, *De Wette*, *v. Lengerke*, in the works named in § 42, Note 2; and in a peculiar way by *Ewald*, Gesch. i. p. 81 ff.—Comp. *my* Commentary, p. vi. ff. [*Bleek*, pp. 313–317, adduces the following instances of double accounts, the second being due to later enlargement:—The two monuments of the passage of the Jordan, the two ambuscades at Ai, and the two returns to the camp, x. 15, 43.]

(2) The seventh edition of *De Wette*, Einl. § 167, still holds firmly to the following instances of contradictions:—(*a*) "The conquest and extermination of all the Canaanites, and the subjugation of the whole land, prescribed to Joshua, xi. 16–23, xii. 7 ff., comp. xxi. 43 ff., xxii. 4; marvellously contradicted by the survey of the land, as yet unsubjugated, which is given at xiii. 1 ff. (comp. also xvii. 14 ff., xviii. 3, xxiii. 5, 12)." But this seeming contradiction is completely removed by considering the reference to the Pentateuch which pervades our book. Accordingly we are informed, on the one hand, keeping in view the divine promises, that God fulfilled these by giving up the Canaanites to defeat and extermination, and by making the Israelites masters of the country. On the other hand, keeping the future in view, it is remarked that here and there Canaanites still remained in possession of individual towns and districts of the land, since, though God had promised utterly to exterminate the Canaanites, yet He was not to do this suddenly and completely at a single blow, Ex. xxiii. 28–30, Deut. vii. 22. It is expressly thus that the statements are adjusted in the closing words of the first part, ch. xi. 23: "So Joshua took the whole land, *according to all that Jehovah said unto Moses*." See *my* Commentary, p. 220 ff.—Two alleged contradictions are destitute of any importance: (*a*) Between x. 36, 38, xi. 21—according to which Hebron and Debîr were

conquered, and the Anakites were cut off from the mountains—and xiv. 12, xv. 14–17, compared with Judg. i. 10, 11, according to which the Anakites were again in possession of these cities at the partition of the land, and were exterminated only after the death of Joshua; comp. *Häv.* ii. 1, p. 19, and *my* Commentary, pp. 198–9. (*β*) Between xii. 10, 12, 16, 21, 23—according to which the kings of Jerusalem, Gezer, Bethel, Megiddo, and Dor were smitten by Joshua — and xv. 63, xvi. 10, xvii. 11, 12, compared with Judg. i. 21, 29, 22, 27, according to which these cities remained in the hands of the Canaanites; for we need to distinguish well between smiting the kings and taking their cities. Comp. *König*, p. 19, and *v. Lengerke*, p. 670.—(*b*) "According to i. 6, xi. 23, xii. 7, xiii. 7, xiv. 1–5, we expect the land to be proportionally divided among the people immediately after the completion of the conquest; whereas, after Judah, Ephraim, and the half tribe of Manasseh have obtained their portions (ch. xv.–xvii.), this process is interrupted, as is pretended, on account of the slackness of the people (xviii. 3), and it is resumed (apparently at a different place, Shiloh, xviii. 1, xix. 51), and the former partition is altered in various particulars, xviii. 11–xix. 51." But these latter passages merely show that the expectation of the critics derived from the former passages is unfounded. As to the precise cause of the interruption, and as to the modifications of the first partition which became necessary in the second, compare *my* Commentary, p. 264 ff. [or the statement in *Fairbairn's* Bible Dictionary, art. Joshua, p. 964]. —(*c*) According to ch. i.–xi., Joshua conducts the war at the head of all the tribes; on the contrary, according to xv. 15 ff., xvii. 14 ff., and xix. 47 ff., individual tribes go forth on conquering expeditions. This contradiction has been produced by criticism itself, through misinterpretation of ch. xv., xvii., xix.; for the conquests by individual tribes mentioned here did not occur till after the partition of the land, partly till after the death of Joshua [?]; whereas criticism has placed them anterior to these events, in opposition to the plain words of the text. Comp. *Keil*, Zeitschrift f. d. luth. Theol. 1846, p. 3 ff.— (*d*) "Ch. xxiv. 23, according to which the people still serve strange gods, stands in contradiction to repeated statements that the position of the people under Joshua, with reference to divine worship, was quite in harmony with the law, ch. iii. 3 ff., v. 1–12, viii. 33, etc." But the matter spoken of here is not gross outward idolatry; it is only the adherence of the heart to strange gods, which is perfectly consistent with an outwardly correct position in reference to worship. Comp. *my* Commentary on ch. xxiv. 14, 23. [Nor would there be any inconsistency if it were so that Joshua suspected, or knew by

divine revelation, that there was actual outward idolatry among them; only practised so secretly, and to so small an extent, that it was unsuspected by the congregation, whose fidelity to the law was therefore unimpugned.]—(*c*) Finally, still less is there any contradiction between the sanctuary of Jehôvah at Shechem, xxiv. 26, and the sanctuary of the tabernacle of the congregation at Shiloh. Comp. *my* Commentary on the passage.

(3) Differences in the mode of thinking and in expression have been discovered by *Stähelin*, p. 86 ff.; whence he has inferred that the fundamental document discovered in the Pentateuch forms the basis of this book also, and has been wrought up and enlarged by the Jehovist or Deuteronomist in such a way, that the geographical sections, ch. xiii. 15–xiv. 5, xv. 1–12, 20–62, xvi.–xvii. 13, xviii. 11–xxi. 43, are said to belong to the original, while again the historical portions, ch. i.–xii., xxii.–xxiv., together with the historical remarks in the geographical sections, are the supplementer's. Comp. also *De Wette*, § 168, and *v. Lengerke*, p. lxxxv. f. The arguments for this opinion are the following:—

A. Differences in the mode of thinking:—(*a*) "In the historical sections, Joshua alone comes before us as a prominent actor, while Eleazar also acts in the geographical sections,"—namely, because the high priest was not called to draw the sword and command the army, but according to Num. xxxiv. 17 ff. he had to direct the partition of the land.—(*b*) "In the historical sections, 'the officers' (i. 10, iii. 2), or the elders and judges along with them (viii. 33, xxiii. 2, xxiv. 1), show themselves active at every opportunity; whereas the geographical sections speak of 'the heads of the fathers of the tribes,' xxi. 1, xiv. 1." The simple explanation is, that the officers, elders, and judges did not belong to that commission nominated by Moses for the division of the land by lot, [whereas, in the cases where *all* the authorities seem to have been gathered, xxiii. 2, xxiv. 1, "the heads" are mentioned along with the others].—(*c*) "In i. 4 the Euphrates is named as the eastern boundary of the land; in xiii. 13 ff. it is otherwise;" because the latter is a precise geographical designation, and the former is a divine promise, which has something of an oratorical character, and becomes more narrowly determined only by the addition, "the whole land of the Hittites." Comp. *my* Commentary on i. 4.—(*d*) "In xv. 11, 45–47, 63, the Philistine cities appear to be possessed by Judah. It is quite different in xiii. 3, and in the geographical portion, where nothing is said of the Philistines." But it does not follow in the least that Ekron, Gaza, and Ashdod, with their surrounding districts, were already actually in the possession

of the tribe of Judah, from the fact that they had been assigned to it by lot. Comp. my Commentary, p. xviii.—(*e*) "The geographical sections have introductory remarks, xiv. 1–5, and concluding formulas, xv. 12, xvi. 9, xviii. 20, 28, xix. 8, 16, 23, 31, 39, 48, 51, xx. 9." These are found also in the historical sections:—Introductory remarks, v. 1, ix. 1, x. 1, xi. 1; formal superscriptions, xii. 1, 7; and concluding formulas, x. 40–43, xi. 23, xiv. 15. [Had it even been as the objection implies, the argument would amount to nothing.]

B. Differences in expression:—(*a*) "In the historical sections שֵׁבֶט is predominantly used for 'tribe,' iii. 12, iv. 2, 4, 12, vii. 14, 16, xviii. 2, 4, 7, xxii. 7, 9 ff., xxiii. 4, xxiv. 1; but in the geographical, מַטֶּה predominantly, xiii. 15, 24, xiv. 1–4, xv. 1, 20, 21, xvii. 1, xviii. 11, xix. 1, 24, 40, 48, xx. 8, xxi. 4 ff." This usage, merely predominantly but not exclusively, is explained by the difference in the meaning of the two words. שֵׁבֶט (probably after the Arabic *sabita*, "non crispa, sed in longum porrecta fuit res, sine flexura in rectum et longum protensa fuit") is the straight, outstretched staff, the ruler's staff, the sceptre, and by a metonomy the *tribe*, as a *stem*, propagated in a direct line, as a ruling power (comp. *Tholuck*, litt. Anzeiger 1849, p. 276); or "tribus quæ sceptro s. duci paret," as *Fähnlein* is used "de iis qui vexillum sequuntur" (*Winer*, Lex. *s.v.*). On the contrary, מַטֶּה, the *branch* or *twig*, metaphorically the branch of a nation [or family], denotes the race in its genealogical ramification. To this diversity of meaning corresponds not only the combination of the two words in Num. xviii. 2, Josh. xiii. 29, but also the use of the latter as well in the geographical as in the historical sections in genealogical accounts, vii. 1, 18, xxii. 1, 14; and also the use of the former not only in the historical portions, ch. i.–xii., but also in xiii. 29, 33, xviii. 1–10, xxi. 16, and xxiii. and xxiv., since here the tribes of Israel appear as corporations, little independent powers.—(*b*) "The historical portion uses the rare word מחלקה, xi. 23, xii. 7, xviii. 10, with which we never meet in the other part." But ch. xviii. 10 does belong to the geographical part. And this word could not be oftener employed, because it expresses under one general conception the different divisions of the people into tribes, and families, and households, all taken together: this takes place only in the historical surveys, while in the geographical part individual tribes and families are mentioned.—(*c*) "The expression in the geographical portion, ירדן יריחו, xiii. 32, xvi. 1, xx. 8, is awanting in the historical sections, which give another turn to the words for the same idea in xviii. 7" [the expression being the same entirely as in xiii. 32 and xx. 8, with the omission merely of יריחו]. But xviii. 7 speaks of the entire territory of Israel to the east

of Jordan; and this expression would there have been inapplicable, since it is used only of the plains of Moab, which lay on the other side of Jordan, opposite to Jericho: comp. Num. xxii. 1, xxvi. 3, 63, xxxi. 12, xxxiii. 48, 50, xxxvi. 13, also in xxxiv. 15 (in spite of *Düsterdieck's* doubt without any reason in the Göttingen gel. Anzeiger, Sept. 1848, p. 1420).—(*d*) "Moses is styled 'the servant of Jehovah' only in the historical sections." This has not even the appearance of being correct, unless we cut out every historical remark from the geographical sections; for otherwise, see xii. 6, xiii. 8, xiv. 7, xviii. 7. But after all, it is deceptive, because the simple name of Moses stands 34 times in the entire book, 22 of these times in the passages said to be historical; and this predicate is applied to him in all only 17 times.—(*e*) "In the historical sections we read of 'the priests the Levites,' [which indicates the Deuteronomist to *Bleek*, pp. 314, 315], iii. 3, viii. 33, or merely 'the priests,' iii. 6, 15, vi. 4, 6, etc.; but in the geographical portions, 'the sons of Aaron,' xxi. 4, 10, 13, 19,"—the reason being, that in ch. xxi. the priests are considered only in respect of their genealogical descent, and not of their office and position.—(*f*) Finally, the difference in style, which *Hauff* urges, *ibid.* p. 132 ff.,—the historical portion being distinguished by a fulness of expression and by harmoniously rounded periods, whereas in several passages of the second part (ch. xvi. xvii.) the repetitions or parenthetical remarks have been made at the expense of perspicuity,—all this is completely explained by the difference in the subject-matter. There is no room for lengthy, finely poised, rounded periods, in accounts of boundaries and lists of cities; and occasional obscurity may spring from the historical sources of which there has use been made.

All these arguments prove, not a diversity of authorship, but only the incapacity of the so-called criticism for any real understanding of the book.

(4) The idea on which the entire book rests, and according to which its contents are arranged, is distinctly announced at the very beginning, in the divine command to Joshua, and the associated promise, i. 2–9. At the same time the contents of the two parts are intimated, vers. 5–8: in ver. 5, the conquest effected by the divine assistance (i. 10–xii.); in ver. 6, the partition of the land (xiii.–xxii.); in vers. 7, 8, the contents of xxiii. xxiv. Besides, the individual sections of the book are intimately interconnected by transitions and references to what had preceded. The conclusion of the first part already points forward to the division of the land, ch. xiii.–xxii.; and the conclusion of the history of the partition, xxi. 43–45, points back not only to xi. 23, but also to i. 2–6. So xxii. 1–4 points back to i. 12–15 and

iv. 12, 13. And not only do the words of Joshua (xxiii. and xxiv.) presuppose the entire history of the conquest and partition of the land; but also the introduction to this last act of Joshua's (xxiii. 1, 2) is attached immediately to xxii. 3, 4, more remotely to xxi. 43, 44, as the conclusion (xxiv. 28) again is to xxi. 43; whilst the words, "Joshua was old," etc., xxiii. 1, point back to xiii. 1. Finally, the representation of the whole book is penetrated and animated by the idea expressed in i. 3, 5, 9, that Jehovah would be with Joshua as He had been with Moses: this is shown by i. 17, iii. 7, iv. 14, 23, vi. 2, 3, 27, viii. 1, 18, x. 8, 14, 42, xiii. 6, xxiii. 5, 9, 10, xxiv. 10, 13, 18. Comp. *König*, p. 3 ff.

§ 44. *Date of Composition.*

The book of Joshua cannot have been first composed after the exile, or shortly before it under Josiah or Manasseh (1); but, according to various indications of its age, not later than at the beginning of the reign of Saul, and indeed even earlier. For according to xvi. 10, the Canaanites still dwelt in Gezer; but according to 1 Kings ix. 16, they were exterminated by Pharaoh king of Egypt in the beginning of Solomon's reign or the end of that of David. According to xv. 63, the Jebusites are not yet expelled from Jerusalem: this was accomplished by David, in the very beginning of his reign over all the tribes, 2 Sam. v. 5–9. According to ix. 27, the place of the temple is not yet chosen, though this was fixed so early as in David's time, 2 Sam. xxiv. 18 ff., 1 Chron. xxi. 18 ff., xxii. 1; and the Gibeonites are still hewers of wood and drawers of water for the congregation and the altar, in conformity with the treaty which Joshua and the elders made with them, which however was abolished by Saul's bloody crime committed against them, 2 Sam. xxi. 1 ff. According to xi. 8, xix. 28, Sidon is the chief city of Phœnicia, and according to xiii. 4–6 the Sidonians or Phœnicians belong to the Canaanites who are to be exterminated: to this class they could no longer have been reckoned in David's time, 2 Sam. v. 11, 1 Kings v. 15, 1 Chron. xiv. 1, [at which time, moreover, Tyre has taken the highest place, instead of Sidon] (2). In favour of an early date of composition there is also the language of the book, which is not only free from all clear traces of a later age, but also bears indubitably a character of antiquity (3).

(1) *Masius*, *Spinoza*, *Hasse*, and *Maurer* place the composition after the exile; *v. Lengerke*, p. cxxv. ff., in the time of Josiah; *Ewald*, Gesch. i. p. 156, 171, under Manasseh, contemporaneously with Deuteronomy; [so *Bleek*, pp. 324–5, who thinks that the Deuteronomist was the editor of our present book of Joshua, detecting his hand in the interpolations, as he calls them, viii. 30–35, xiv. 6–15. He fully admits the high antiquity of some of the documents embraced in it]. See the different opinions in *Carpzov*, Introd. i. 150 sqq., and in *König*, p. 133 ff.

(2) The whole of the reasons which weigh with *Maurer*, p. xix., and *De Wette*, § 169, for a later date, are unconvincing. The notice about the sixty Havoth-jair, xiii. 30, compared with 1 Kings iv. 13, does not contradict Judg. x. 4; comp. § 38, VII.—The book of Songs [book of Jashar], quoted x. 13, did not first come into existence in or after the time of David; but it was a collection of songs in praise of theocratic heroes, which came into existence in successive periods from the time of Joshua onwards, and into it also David's elegy on Saul and Jonathan was admitted, 2 Sam. i. 18. [*Bleek* says, p. 317, the book of Jashar could not well have been composed, at least could not well have been completed, before the age of David; which is a statement quite compatible with the early composition of Joshua.]—The names "Jerusalem" and "mountains of Israel," x. 1, xi. 16, 21, did not first come into use under David, but go back to the age of Moses; comp. *Häv.* pp. 51–2, and *my* Commentary on Josh. xi. 21. And it does not follow from 2 Sam. xxiv. 18 ff., that at that time the Jebusites were not yet expelled from Jerusalem (*v. Lengerke*, p. 658). Finally, from vi. 26, compared with 1 Kings xvi. 34, it is much more natural to infer that our book was composed before Ahab's time, than the contrary (see *my* Commentary, p. xxxii.). Also comp. *Welte* on *Herbst's* Einl. ii. 1, p. 93 ff., and *König*, p. 70 ff., though much that is not convincing has slipped in there, against which see *my* Commentary, p. xxxv., note.

(3) Of *Maurer's* (p. xix.) and *De Wette's* (Einl. § 170) linguistic marks, עָבוּר, v. 11, 12, and נִכְסִים, xxii. 8, do not prove a later linguistic character, though the former never occurs again, and the latter only in 2 Chron. i. 11, 12, Eccles. v. 18, vi. 2. All the rest are either found already in the earliest language,—for instance, the use of the article as a relative, x. 24, compared with Gen. xviii. 21, xxi. 3, etc., and עֵבֶר הַיַּרְדֵּן, v. 1, ix. 1, xii. 7, xxii. 7 [here with the addition "westwards"], of Canaan to the west of Jordan, which points back to the age of Moses; or are just to be held as archaisms, like אוֹתְכֶם for אֶתְכֶם, xxiii. 15, אֹתִי for אֵתִי, הִמְסִיו, xiv. 8; or they are adduced quite erroneously,

as הִשְׂכִּיל in the sense arbitrarily assigned to it, "to prosper" (comp. Gen. iii. 6), and the position of the numeral last, xii. 24, xv. 36, and some others. Comp. *my* Commentary, p. xxxvi. ff. [On the contrary, we should scarcely have found a late writer using אלהים with a plural adjective, in reference to the one true God, as at xxiv. 19.]

Yet the book has not been written by Joshua himself (4). We do not so much arrive at this conclusion from the oft-repeated formula "unto this day," which proves merely that the book in its present shape is not quite contemporaneous with the events recorded, as from the accounts, xv. 13–19, 63, xix. 47, which treat of events subsequent to the death of Joshua, if we may judge from Judg. i. 10–15, 8, and ch. xviii. To the same period the following passages refer: Josh. xiii. 2–5 and Judg. iii. 3, Josh. xvi. 10 and Judg. i. 9, Josh. xvii. 11, 12 and Judg. i. 27, 28, also Josh. xxiv. 29–33 (5); while v. 1, 6 show that the author was one of the Israelites who crossed the Jordan with Joshua, and not improbably one of "the elders that overlived Joshua" (ch. xxiv. 31; Judg. ii. 7), who wrote the history of his times towards the end of his life, and after the death of Joshua and Eleazar (6).

(4) So latest, *König*, pp. 63 ff., after Baba bathra f. 14, c. 2. Neither xxiv. 26, 29 ("the servant of Jehovah" applied to Joshua), nor the frequent honourable mention of Caleb, nor the fact that the whole book breathes the spirit of Moses, as it could have been comprehended only by Joshua, his constant assistant (*Jahn*, Einl. ii. 1, p. 160), are convincing proofs. Comp. *Steudel, ibid.* p. 483 f., and *my* Commentary, p. xxxix. ff.

(5) The formula "unto this day" occurs in iv. 9, v. 9, vi. 25, vii. 26, viii. 28, 29, ix. 27, xiii. 13, xiv. 14, xv. 63, xvi. 10, xxii. 3, 17, and xxiii. 8, 9 (in the mouth of Joshua, of what had happened to the people till these last addresses of his). Of these passages, iv. 9, vi. 25 (that Rahab dwelt till this day among the Israelites), and xiv. 14, refer rather to the times of Joshua than to times subsequent to his death, and the rest do not at least imply that centuries had elapsed. Comp. *König*, p. 95 ff., and *my* Commentary, p. xliii. ff. [See some notice of the phrase "unto this day" already, in the discussions on the Pentateuch, § 38, I., and Note 2.] We are carried beyond the time of Joshua's death by the accounts of Caleb's conquest of Hebron, and Othniel's conquest of Debir (xv. 13–19), and that of Leshem by the Danites (xix. 47), as is plain from a comparison with Judg. i.

10–15 and xviii.; and xv. 63 presupposes the attack upon Jerusalem, related in Judg. i. 8 as having been undertaken after Joshua's death. The other passages adduced above are less convincing; comp. *my* discussion in the Zeitschrift f. d. luth. Theol. 1846, p. 3 ff., 27 f. [In *Fairbairn's* Bible Dictionary, art. Joshua, pp. 965–967, reasons are assigned for preferring the view that Joshua was himself the writer of the book. For one thing, *Keil* does not distinguish the time of Joshua's death from the time of his retiring from public life.]

(6) The words, v. 6, "Unto whom Jehovah sware that He would not show them the land which Jehovah sware unto their fathers that He would give *us*," might perhaps be taken in an indefinite sense, applying to all Israelites; but ver. 1, "When all the kings . . . heard that Jehovah had dried up the waters of Jordan from before the children of Israel, until *we* were passed over," cannot be so taken of Israel "in their national generality," after the analogy of Ps. lxvi. 6, but are the words of an eye-witness, like Ezra v. 4; and they prove that the author was one of those who passed through the Jordan under Joshua, since they stand in a verse which makes a transition, and cannot have been extracted as it stood from a contemporaneous source. Comp. *Häv.* p. 26, and *my* Commentary, p. xlii.

§ 45. *Sources of Information, and Historical Character.*

The author might describe the events for the most part from his own recollection, since he lived among them, according to v. 1, 6. Moreover, the first part of the book contains few certain traces of the use of written sources of information (1); but at the foundation of the second part, in the geographical lists, there lie unquestionably the protocols drawn up at the partition of the land; and likewise for the history of the renewal of the covenant at Shechem (ch. xxiv.), there is the public document drawn up in reference to it, and entered into the book of the law, ver. 26 (2).

(1) Besides the verses of a song from the book of Jashar, x. 12 ff., in praise of the great things which were then done, nothing here has been drawn from written documents, unless the more precise statistical accounts, such as iv. 13, vii. 4, 5, viii. 12, 25, and the list of the thirty-one conquered kings.

(2) We arrive at the conclusion that in ch. xiii.–xxi. use has been made of the public documents drawn up in reference to the partition of the land, not so much from xviii. 4–9, as from the two following

considerations. The one is the nature of the case; the territories and cities assigned to the individual tribes must necessarily have been recorded in some sort of protocol, in order to prevent endless future disputes upon the subject. The other is a comparison of the lists of the cities in the tribe of Simeon, xix. 2–8, and of the Levitical and priestly cities, ch. xxi., with those in 1 Chron. iv. 28–33, vi. 39–66, which shows that the chronicler has used independent lists (comp. *my* Apol. Versuch üb. die Chron. p. 174 ff., 182 ff.); and so also with the parallel passages in the book of Joshua and in Judges, especially ch. xv. 13 ff. and Judg. i. 10 ff., which have proceeded from a common source. Comp. *my* Discussion, *ibid.* p. 39 ff. [§ 44, Note 5].

The historical character of the book is based upon the sources from which the author has drawn, and upon his being an eye-witness. Perverted prejudices have led to the denial of this character; but there can be no reasonable hesitation on the subject when we look to the contents, which bear testimony to the careful use of authorities, to the genuine theocratic conception of the whole time, in harmony with the law, and to the faithful pictures of prominent individual characters, Joshua, Caleb (xiv. 6 ff.), and Phinehas (ch. xxii.) (3).

(3) All the objections to the historical credibility of the book proceed from unscriptural and spiritless conceptions of God and of His government of the world; and they consist of senseless refusals to believe the great things which He did in order to realize His kingdom. Comp. *Eichhorn*, Einl. iii. p. 409; *De Wette*, Einl. § 166; *Vatke*, *v. Lengerke*, etc.; and, on the other side, *Häv.* Einl. ii. 1, p. 2 ff., and *Steudel*, p. 469 ff. The same holds true of the objections to the historical and moral character of the narrative, from the nature of the Israelites' legal claims to Palestine, and from the extermination of the Canaanites. Comp. *Hengstb.* Beitrr. iii. p. 471 ff., and *my* Commentary, p. xlvii. ff.—Where the miraculous element does not cause offence, the historical fidelity of the book is acknowledged even by its opponents; comp., for instance, *Eichhorn*, pp. 366–7; *Ewald*, Gesch. ii. p. 227; *v. Lengerke*, p. 637.

THE BOOK OF JUDGES (שֹׁפְטִים).

Commentaries: — *N. Serarius*, *Bonfrerius*, *Brentius*, *V. Strigel*, *Chytræus*, *J. A. Osiander*, *Seb. Schmidt.*—*Bucer*, *Drusius*, *Clericus*,

Rosenmüller, Maurer; see § 224 sq.—*Ziegler*, Bemerk. üb. d. B. der Richter, in his theol. Abhandl. i. p. 275 ff.; *G. L. Studer*, d. B. der Richter gramm. u. hist. erklärt, Bern 1835, 2d ed. 1842 [under a new title, *Bleek*, p. 349]; *E. Bertheau*, d. B. der Richter u. Rut erklärt, Leipzig 1845 (sixth part of the Exeget. Handbuch).

Ger. Jo. Lette, observatt. philol. crit. in augustiss. Deboræ et Mosis Cantica, Jud. v. et Ex. xv., Lugd. Batav. 1745-48; also his novæ et tertiæ curæ ad aug. Deboræ Canticum, Jud. v., in the appendix to his animadvv. sacræ, 1759. *Chr. Fr. Schnurrer*, dissert. in Deboræ Cantic. Jud. v., Tubingæ 1775; reprinted in his Dissertatt. philol. crit., Gothæ 1790. *G. H. Hollmann*, Commentar. philol. crit. in carmen Deboræ, Jud. v., Lipsiæ 1818. *Herm. Henr. Kemink*, commentat. de carmine Deboræ, Trajecti ad Rhenum 1840. *Chr. H. Kalkar*, quæstionum bibl. specim. i., de cantico Deboræ, Othin. 1835. *G. Boettger*, commentar. exeg. crit. in Deboræ cantic. Jud. v., in *Käuffer*, bibl. Studien, i.–iii., Dresden u. Leipzig 1842–44. *Fr. Bötcher*, die ælteste Bühnendichtungen, der Debora-Gesang und das Hohelied dram. hergestellt u. übers., Leipzig 1850. [*Nägelsbach*, in *Herzog's* Encycl. art. Richter, mentions two works: *Th. S. Rordam*, Libri Judicum et Ruth, sec. versionem Syriaco-hexaplarem, ex codice Musei Britann., etc., 1849, 4to; *Wähl*, üb. d. Verfasser d. B. d. Richter, Tübingen 1849, 4to. *Keil's* own Commentary has now appeared in the series edited by him and Delitzsch, 1863.]

§ 46. *Contents, Title, and Object.*

There is an introduction, which presents a pragmatic survey of the political and religious side of the formation of the theocratic life of the people after the times of Joshua (i.–iii. 6) (1). Then the principal events of the period [that is, principal from the theocratic point of view] from the death of Joshua till the time of Samuel are presented in a series of historical pictures: in these is clearly seen the constant cycle—of apostasy by the people into idolatry; of a consequent divine chastisement, in the shape of oppression inflicted by the heathen neighbours of Israel; and of a glorious deliverance out of bondage to the chastened people as they return to the Lord, effected by individuals named judges, endowed by God with extraordinary powers for conquering the enemy (2). The book is named after these judges, of whom thirteen or fourteen are mentioned, though the deeds of no more than six are narrated at length, the others being named only

briefly; so that the principal contents of the book are comprised in seven smaller or larger groups (3).

(1) The pragmatic introduction does not extend merely to ii. 5 (*De Wette*) nor to ii. 10 (*Bertheau*, B. d. Richter, p. xi. 52 ff., and 58), but to iii. 6; and it falls into two sections, which run parallel (comp. i. 1 with ii. 8, and ii. 2, 3 with iii. 4–6). The former presents a survey of the political relation of the tribes of Israel to the remaining Canaanites (i. 1–ii. 5); the latter depicts the relative position of Israel towards Jehovah in respect of religion, and that of Jehovah towards Israel, as one of constant change from guilt to punishment, and from repentance to gracious acceptance (ii. 6–iii. 6). *Hengstb.* (Beitrr. iii. p. 29) errs in saying, "Ch. i. takes a survey of the incidents as they assumed shape from the partition of the land till the death of Joshua; then ch. ii. 1–iii. 6 takes a survey of what occurred afterwards, the prelude being found at ii. 1–5, and the performance in full at ii. 6 ff." For the contents of ch. i. do not belong to the times preceding Joshua's death, but the contrary. Comp. p. 31 ff. of *my* Discussion quoted in § 41, Note 2; *Häv.* ii. 1, p. 67 ff.

(2) שֹׁפְטִים, *κριταί* (Sept.), are properly *δικασταί*, men who executed judgment for the people against their tyrants. Ch. ii. 16, iii. 9, 10, 15, iv. 15, are passages which indicate their sphere and mode of action. See the various views in *Winer*, Real-Wörterbuch, ii. p. 323 ff. [*Bleek*, p. 341, still compares the Carthaginian *sufes*, *sufetes*, as Livy calls them.]

(3) The attempts of *Bertheau*, p. 53, and *Ewald*, Geschichte, ii. pp. 363–4, to bring out the significant number of *twelve* judges, prove their own arbitrariness by the variations in the numbering (comp. *Winer*, *ibid.*). [*Bleek*, pp. 350, 352, also thinks their schemes quite fanciful.] Indeed, there are fourteen judges from Othniel to Samson, if we include Abimelech, who reigned at Shechem for three years over Israel, ix. 22.—The seven groups of our book are also wrongly enumerated by *Bertheau*, pp. 52–3; since ii. 13–iii. 6 forms no independent portion of the book, but belongs still to the mere introduction.—The seven groups are the following: (1) Othniel, iii. 7–11; (2) Ehud and Shamgar, iii. 12–31; (3) Deborah and Barak, iv. v.; (4) Gideon, vi. 1–viii. 32; (5) Abimelech, Tola, Jair, viii. 33–x. 5; (6) Jephthah, Ibzan, Elon, Abdon, x. 6–xii. 15; (7) Samson, xiii.–xvi. [This arrangement is not very satisfactory, and at viii. 33 does not quite carry out *Keil's* own principle, § 34, Note 3, where he makes each of the seven sections begin with the children of Israel "doing evil in the sight of Jehovah." Hence in his second Commentary he

unites the fourth and fifth sections; and by doing so, he no longer tears asunder the history of Gideon from that of his family. Another division will be suggested in connection with some remarks on the chronology at § 48.]

A twofold appendix contains the narratives of the idolatry of the Danites,.ch. xvii. xviii., and of the wickedness of the Gibeonites, which led to an exterminating war against the tribe of Benjamin by the congregation, ch. xix.–xxi.: it stands in no necessary internal connection with the rest of the book (4).

(4) [This statement may be correct, if we put a very stringent meaning on the words "necessary connection;" otherwise there is some ground for the rejoinder of *Nägelsbach*, in Herzog's Encycl. art. Richter, Buch. d., that the history of Abimelech might have been equally placed at the end, but for its connection with Gideon. Perhaps we should say that these two accounts are placed at the end of the book, rather than near the beginning, which would have been their chronological position, because they throw light upon the condition of the people throughout the whole period embraced in its history; exhibiting, as they do, the two great forms of degeneracy, in the direct service of God and in practical morality, which were continually at work, bringing after them the chastisement of God, and so leading the people anew to repentance. In some respects the book of Ruth might be considered a counterpart to these, though we see no reason for imagining that it ever actually formed a part of the book of Judges; see as to this at § 136, § 137.] Both occurrences belong to the first times after the death of Joshua. We reach this conclusion, in reference to the second, from ch. xx. 27, 28; in reference to the first, by comparing ch. i. 34 with Josh. xix. 47. It is impossible to infer from ch. iv. v., and especially v. 17, that the Danites were later of emigrating, as *Bertheau* does, p. 197. Comp. *Herbst*, Einl. ii. 1, p. 118, note.

The book pursues the genuine object of a theocratic writer. It indicates the attitude of Israel toward their God, and of the Lord toward His people, during the first period after they had taken possession of the promised land, so as to evince that the faithful covenant God ruled His congregation in righteousness and mercy; and thus it warns and instructs for the time to come (ii. 6–23) (5).

(5) Hence are explained the arrangement and the division of the historical matter which has been introduced, the apparent imperfection of the history, and the relation of the appendix to the body of the book. Comp. *Hengstb.* p. 20 ff.—As to the practical value of the book for our times, see *Carpzov*, Introd. i. p. 177 sq.

§ 47. *Unity of the Composition.*

The reasons are very weak, on account of which men have controverted sometimes the internal unity of the individual parts, and sometimes the unity of connection in the introduction, the body of the work, and the appendix (1).

(1) So *Ziegler*, theol. Abhandll. i. p. 283 ff.; *Bertholdt*, p. 875 ff.; *Studer*, p. 1 ff.; *De Wette*, Einl. § 174; *Stähelin*, krit. Unterss. üb. d. Pent. p. 102 ff., and p. 145 ff.; *Bertheau*, p. xv. ff.; *Ewald*, Gesch. i. p. 186 ff. On the contrary, comp. *Häv.* p. 68 ff.; *Welte* on *Herbst's* Einl. p. 125 ff. [*Bleek*, pp. 344–6, thinks that ch. i. was in the Elohistic work, as also at least those parts which are also found in Joshua, but that the most of it is Jehovistic, and that ii. 6–23 is considerably later; yet he holds the work to be earlier than Deuteronomy, on account of the variety of places at which sacrifices were offered, etc.,—a reason which has been discussed at § 34, Note 4, of this work. Yet again *Bleek*, p. 349, rejects the notion of *Studer*, that it was composed, as if in order of time, from an old book which gave accounts of the heroes of the different tribes, and that it is of the age of Josiah. At pp. 349–352 he rejects *Ewald's* views, as being complicated and unfounded; and he rejects *Bertheau's* at p. 352. See as to these in § 49, Note 3.]

For the introduction, i.–iii. 6, without which the rest of the book would be an *ἀκέφαλον*, contains neither contradictions in matter of fact between i. 8 and i. 21, and between i. 19 and iii. 2 (2), nor a different conception of the fact that the earlier inhabitants of the land were not extirpated by the Israelites (3). Nor in the body of the work can it be shown that discordant and heterogeneous accounts have ever been worked up together (4). And just as little does there prevail a different way of looking at events, or a difference in the *usus loquendi*, in ch. i. and xvii.–xxi., from that in the remainder of the book, such as puts an end to the unity of the composition (5).

(2) The statement, i. 8, that the children of Judah took Jerusalem and set it on fire, does not imply the capture of the stronghold Jebus on Mount Zion; nor does it exclude the subsequent rebuilding of the city, in which the Jebusites spread themselves abroad, so that the Benjamites could not drive them out (i. 21). Comp. *Häv.* p. 72; *Welte*, p. 110; and *my* Discussion [see § 44, Note 5], pp. 36–7.—Again, the capture of the cities Gaza, Askelon, and Ekron by the tribe of Judah, i. 18, is not in the least opposed to iii. 3, that Jehovah left the five lords of the Philistines on purpose to prove Israel, since i. 18 knows nothing of the killing of these princes. Comp. *Häv.* p. 74, and *my* Discussion, pp. 37–8. [*Bleek*, p. 344, admits this, yet thinks that the same writer would scarcely have mentioned the two things as is here done. But if we remember how the carnal and the spiritual Israel were so intimately conjoined, and how discipline implies both chastisement and exertion, neither this, nor the comparison of the reasons for sparing the heathen, ch. ii. 20–iii. 4, will occasion us any difficulty. *Bleek* also thinks it unnatural in the writer to begin, i. 1, "Now after the death of Joshua," etc., and then to record this death at ii. 6 ff.; but it is most natural to believe that the verb in i. 8 is in the pluperfect tense, as in the English version.]—The attempt of *Bertheau* to ascribe ch. i. to some one else than the author of the rest of the book, bears witness that he utterly mistakes the plan of it.

(3) The assertion of *Bertheau*, p. xv., that, "according to i.–ii. 5, the Canaanites were not destroyed because the Israelites preferred to live along with them rather than to obey the stringent law of extermination; on the contrary, that, according to ii. 11–iii. 6, the Israelites lost the power of exterminating them through their own idolatry, and that living along with them, and all the injurious consequences of this, are a punishment on account of idolatry," contains a wilful distortion of the declarations of our book; since, according to ii. 20 ff. as well as ii. 2, 3, Jehovah was pleased not to drive out the remaining Canaanites because the Israelites had not obeyed His voice, but had broken His covenant. [Also see what has been added in Note 2.]

(4) The unity from iii. 7 to xvi. 31 is proved at once by the frequent recurrence of the expression, "The children of Israel did evil in the sight of Jehovah," iii. 7, vi. 1, comp. ii. 11 ff.; or, they "again did evil," etc., iii. 12, iv. 1, x. 6, xiii. 1; and וַתִּשְׁלֹט הָאָרֶץ, iii. 11, 30, v. 31, viii. 28 (comp. Josh. xi. 23 and xiv. 15, but without telling for how long): by peculiar expressions, like זָעַק or צָעַק, "to call together," iv. 10, 13, vi. 34, 35, vii. 23, 24, x. 17, xii. 1, 2, xviii. 22, 23 (comp. Josh. viii. 16, 1 Sam. xiii. 4, xiv. 20); סָכַר בְּיַד, ii. 14, iii. 8, iv. 2, 9, x. 7 (comp. Deut. xxxii. 30, 1 Sam. xii. 9); שִׁלַּח חֶרֶב,

iii. 22, viii. 10, 20, ix. 54, xx. 2, 15, 17, 25, 35, 46 (comp. 2 Sam. xxiv. 9, 2 Kings iii. 26, 1 Chron. xxi. 5); and others besides: also by the theocratic pragmatism which is very decidedly prominent through the whole book, and in which *Stähelin* (Studien u. Krit. 1835, p. 474 ff., and krit. Unterss. p. 107 ff.) has erroneously discovered the style, manner, and theology of the Jehovah-source of the Pentateuch. For the resemblances to the Pentateuch, on the one hand, consist merely in facts and ideas which are founded generally in the essence of the theocracy, such as miracles and signs, appearances of the Angel of Jehovah, sacrifices, and so on; on the other hand, they extend not merely to the so-called Jehovistic and Deuteronomic portions (ii. 2, 3, with Ex. xxiii. 24–33; ii. 17 with Deut. ix. 16 and Ex. xxxii. 8; iii. 6 with Deut. vii. 3, 4; vi. 39 with Gen. xviii. 32: comp. *Hengstb. ibid.*), but just as much to the Elohistic,—for instance, נִאֵקָה, ii. 18 and Ex. ii. 24, vi. 5; עִיר הַתְּמָרִים, i. 16, iii. 13, and Deut. xxxiv. 3; הֶאֱסֹף אֶל־עַמָּיו, ii. 10, in imitation of הֶאֱסֹף אֶל־עַמָּיו, Gen. xxv. 8, 17, and often; the rare word פְּחָזִים, ix. 4, compared with פַּחַז, Gen. xlix. 4: and they are far outweighed by the number of ideas, representations, and words peculiar to this book, and unknown to the Pentateuch and Joshua, which consequently are documentary evidence of its independence. For instance, among things extremely peculiar, there are the details of the circumstances about the appearances of the Angel of Jehovah, vi. 11, 14, 18–21, xiii. 15–20; the representations of the proving of Israel, ii. 22, iii. 1, 2, 4. Expressions unknown to the Pentateuch and Joshua are: נָתַן בְּיַד שִׁסִּים, ii. 14, 2 Kings xvii. 20; הוֹשִׁיעַ מִיַּד שׁוֹסִים, ii. 16, 1 Sam. xiv. 48 [וַיַּצֵּל]; שִׁלַּח בָּאֵשׁ, i. 8, xx. 48, 2 Kings viii. 12, Ps. lxxiv. 7; בַּחֲזָקָה, iv. 3, viii. 1, 1 Sam. ii. 16; תָּעוֹ יָד עַל, iii. 10, vi. 2 (never again in this connection with עַל); the comparison of a vast multitude to locusts, vi. 5, vii. 12 (elsewhere only Nah. iii. 15, Jer. xlvi. 23); טַבּוּר הָאָרֶץ, ix. 37, and Ezek. xxxviii. 12; הִנָּפְשׁ, of a host spreading themselves, xv. 9, and 2 Sam. v. 18, 22; לָפַת, to bend or lean, xvi. 29, Ruth iii. 8, Job vi. 18: the phrases, "he smote them, hip and thigh, with a great slaughter," xv. 8; "a thread of tow when it smelleth the fire," xvi. 9; and many other words already adduced in § 16, Notes 1 and 2.—In the history of Abimelech, ch. ix., the peculiar theocratic references cease to be prominent; yet for this simple reason, that the three years' rule of this worthless man over Shechem exerted no essential influence over the course of development of the collective theocracy, and merely furnished evidence how God punished the wickedness of Abimelech, and the ingratitude of the Shechemites toward Gideon.

(5) The reasons do not stand examination which are offered in

proof of a difference of authorship by *Eichhorn*, Einl. iii. p. 457; *Bertholdt*, p. 876; *Studer*, p. 361; *Stähelin*, krit. Unterss. p. 148; *De Wette*, § 174; *Bertheau*, pp. 192–3. The contents of the two histories in ch. xvii.–xxi., and the age to which they belong, sufficiently explain the absence of that prophetic survey of the history which is predominant in the body of the book. They occurred in the period between the death of Joshua and the first appearance of the judges; and they could no more be placed within that period which, from a prophetic point of view, would seem to belong to the period of the judges, than could the occurrences of which an account is communicated in ch. i.: and yet they contain very clear references to the Mosaic law and its worship, and they are incomprehensible if this law did not rule in Israel (*Hengstb.* p. 37 ff., 45 ff., 52–3), so that there is no room for speaking of an "untheocratic point of view" (*De Wette*).—The *linguistic* peculiarities of these chapters are witnesses in favour of the unity of authorship. For (*a*) they have much in common with ch. i. [as is natural, since both give some accounts of Israel in general, away from the body of the work, which is occupied with the closely knit history of the successive judges], which forms an integral portion of the introduction to the entire book (p. 218): for instance, "Who shall go up first," i. 1 and xx. 18; שְׁאַל בַּיהוָה, i. 1 and xx. 23, 27 (18), along with the similar reply, i. 2 and xx. 18; יוֹאֶל לָשֶׁבֶת, i. 27, 35, and xvii. 11; שִׁלַּח בְּאֵשׁ, i. 8 and xx. 48; הִכָּה לְפִי חָרֶב, i. 8, 25, and xx. 48, comp. iv. 15, 16 (which indeed is frequent in all historical books). In respect of other very characteristic words, they are in harmony with the body of the book: for instance, מָשַׁךְ, "to draw along," of a body of troops, xx. 37 and iv. 6, 7; פָּגַע, "to fall upon, to kill," xviii. 25 and viii. 21, xv. 12; נִזְעַק, "to be called, gathered together," xviii. 22, 23, and vi. 34, 35, and often; שָׁלַח חֶרֶב, (comp. Note 4). Besides, compare עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה, i. 21, 26, xix. 30, and vi. 24, x. 4, xv. 19; נָתַן בְּיָד, i. 2, xviii. 10, xx. 28, and ii. 14, 23, vi. 1, vii. 7, xiii. 1, xv. 12. (*b*) The frequent use of the perfect with *Vav* preceding in i. 8, 16, 21, 25, and often, is conditioned by the peculiar contents of this chapter; while the use of the perfect in narrating what is contemporaneous with that which preceded in xviii. 9, xix. 15, xx. 10, is to be explained by the vividness and liveliness of the delineation. (*c*) The remaining expressions adduced by *Stähelin* and *Bertheau*, ll. cc.—like "burnt-offerings and peace-offerings," xx. 26, xxi. 4; "bitter of soul," xviii. 25; יִיטַב לֵב, xviii. 20, and others—are found not only in the books of Samuel, as *Stähelin* thinks, but also in the rest of the books of the Old Testament where the subject-matter demands it (only פַּחוֹת, "princes," occurs nowhere but in xx. 2, 1 Sam.

xiv. 38; nor נָדַע, "to cut off" men, but in xxi. 6 and 1 Sam. ii. 31); and they are absent from the body of the book of Judges only because its contents presented no opportunity for applying them. This is true also of the formula "from Dan to Beersheba," xx. 1; and "in those days there was no king in Israel," xvii. 6, xviii. 1, xix. 1, xxi. 25. In general, individual peculiarities cannot prove that there have been various authors (such as שִׁבְטֵי בִנְיָמִין, xx. 12; יוֹרֵשׁ עֶצֶר, xviii. 7; מַחְסוֹר כָּל־דָּבָר, xix. 19, xx. 43), for this reason, if for no other, that every section in the whole book is rich in rare words and ἅπαξ λεγόμενα, and presents, in addition, many linguistic peculiarities: for instance, speaking of the Spirit of Jehovah upon the judges, וַתְּהִי עָלָיו, iii. 10, xi. 29; לָבְשָׁה, vi. 34; וְתָחֶל לְפַעֲמוֹ, xiii. 25; וְתִצְלַח עָלָיו, xiv. 6, 19, xv. 14. At the utmost, such phenomena may prove that the author drew his information from various sources.

§ 48. *Chronology of the Book.*

The older theologians endeavoured to bring the chronological statements in this book into harmony with 1 Kings vi. 1, by a variety of combinations, most of them arbitrary (1). The most recent criticism, again, has endeavoured to throw doubt upon the historical character both of this statement, and also of the data within our book, by arbitrary suppositions, and by assumptions in opposition to the text; and thus they have merely augmented the confusion (2).

(1) As to the various computations of the older writers, comp. *Rud. Chr. v. Bennigsen*, bibl. Zeitrechnung, p. 101 ff.; *my* chronol. Untersuchung in the *Dorpat.* theol. Beitrr. ii. p. 303 ff.; and *Winer*, Realwörterbuch, ii. 327.

(2) *Bertheau*, p. xvi. ff., and *Ewald*, Gesch. ii. p. 363 ff., start from the supposition that the number 480 in 1 Kings vi. 1 was first formed at a more recent time in this way: that the whole period between the exodus and Solomon was divided into a dozen periods of 40 years each, in accordance with the traditional twelve judges; and thereafter, 40 years were assigned to each of the judges, the duration of whose administration was unknown, whereas the numbers of the years in the case of the others were known, and therefore were preserved unchanged. In this way the chronological scaffolding of our book would rest upon a combination of two different reckonings of the period which we are now considering. But the absence of even a shadow of probability from this supposition, is proved at once by the

contradictory determinations of these twelve periods by *Bertheau* and *Ewald*, and still more by the violence of their operations. Our book knows nothing of twelve judges: it gives thirteen, and it divides the historical matter from the death of Joshua till Samson into seven groups, so that only eleven periods emerge from Moses to Solomon (even should we place Eli's pontificate as a separate period after the 40 years of Philistine servitude, in contradiction to ch. xiii.–xvi. and 1 Sam. iv.–vii.); for that *other* generation, ii. 10, cannot form a generation existing between Joshua and Othniel. Nor does the Jewish tradition know anything of twelve generations from Moses to David, but in 1 Chron. v. 27 numbers fourteen high priests from Aaron to Azariah (who executed the priest's office in Solomon's temple) exclusively; and for this period *Josephus*, Antiq. xx. 10, gives thirteen, without subjoining the names.

By comparing xi. 26 and x. 7 with 1 Kings vi. 1, we see decidedly that the chronological statements of our book rest upon faithful historical tradition (3), and are to be numbered in succession from the invasion of Chushan-Rishathaim (iii. 8) till Jair (x. 3), but from that point in parallel lines. For, according to x. 7, the invasion of the land of Israel on the east by the Ammonites followed simultaneously with the oppression of the Israelites by the Philistines on the west; so that both the eighteen years of Ammonite oppression, and the years of the judges, Jephthah, Ibzan, Elon, and Abdon (x. 8 and xii. 7–14), fall within the period of Philistine supremacy (xiii. 1), in the course of which Samson for twenty years *began* to deliver Israel out of the hand of the Philistines (xiii. 5 compared with xv. 20, xvi. 31)—the complete deliverance not being accomplished till Samuel arose (1 Sam. vii. 1–14) (4).

(3) According to xi. 26, 300 years elapsed from the fortieth year of the journeying in the wilderness [perhaps not sooner than from the return of the eastern tribes from the wars in Canaan, Josh. xxii. 6] till the appearance of Jephthah. The chronological accounts in our book give in all 301 years for the period from the invasion of Chushan-Rishathaim, not long after Joshua's death, till the invasion of the Ammonites (x. 7). Hence it is clear that the chronology of our book is on the whole exact and correct; and that the assumption of round numbers (which *Ewald*, Gesch. ii. p. 370, himself reprehends) appears quite unjustifiable, and must not be stretched further than this, that the individual periods are reckoned in entire years; and

also in such a way, that the intermediate spaces between the death of a judge and the next hostile invasion are comprehended in the years that this hostile oppression lasted.

(4) See this carried out and established in the *Dorpat.* theol. Beitrr. *ibid.;* also comp. *Hengstb.* Beitrr. iii. p. 23 ff. [This scheme of chronology appears the only one with any plausibility, by which the number 480 in 1 Kings vi. 1 can be upheld as the true number of years from the exodus to the building of Solomon's temple. In *Fairbairn's* Bible Dictionary, however, article Judges, especially at pp. 997–8, some objections are mentioned which seem fatal to the suppositions on which it rests. These are the want of evidence of any such division of the history of Israel into two parallel streams, from ch. x. 7 onwards: the absence of any known connection between Jephthah's successors (Jephthah's own case admitting of something more plausible being said for such a view) and the *eastern* tribes; on the contrary, their apparent connection with the *western* ones, at the very time that these tribes are supposed to have been subject to the Philistines: the improbability that these judges should be ruling at the very time at which Samson was also judge, and that they and their people should have left him utterly unsupported: the necessity for denying that Eli was a judge of Israel at all, except in the sense in which every high priest might be called by this name: the incongruity of supposing that the children of Israel were "lamenting after Jehovah" (1 Sam. vii. 2) in the very 20 years of Samson's judging Israel by his unsupported efforts, during the whole of which the people looked on with faint-hearted or criminal indifference, if not with positive hostility, etc. Nor does the scheme even save the credit of the number 480 years, from which we must deduct at least 130 (for the wandering under Moses, 40 years; for the wars till the partition of Canaan, according to Josh. xiv. 7, 10, not less than 7 years; for the reigns of Saul and David, 40 years each; and the first 3 of Solomon's reign), leaving 350. Of these, 301 had elapsed between the first servitude and Jair's death, and 40 more were spent in subjection to the Philistines, ch. xiii. 1. This leaves the absurdly short term of 9 years to be distributed amongst three periods, whose duration is nowhere determined in Scripture,—namely, Joshua's administration after the partition of Canaan, the administration of the elders who survived him, and the period during which Samuel judged Israel; and this in addition to the inadmissible assumption that Eli's 40 years ought to be struck off. In fact, the number 480 in 1 Kings vi. 1 must be given up as corrupt; and we are also shut up to this course, if we adhere to the plain meaning of the apostle's statement in

Acts xiii. 17–21, where he assigns "about the space of 450 years" to the period of the judges, at the utmost till the time of Samuel inclusive. Accordingly, at p. 993 of that article on Judges, a table of the servitudes and of the administrations of the judges is given in four great periods, as under:—

	Years.	
FIRST PERIOD.—CH. III.–V.		
I. *Servitude*—Chushan-Rishathaim of Mesopotamia, . .	8	
1. Judge—OTHNIEL, ...	40	
II. *Servitude*—Eglon of Moab; also Ammon and Amalek, .	18	
2. Judge—EHUD, ...	80	
3. Judge—SHAMGAR ("slew of the Philistines").		
III. *Servitude*—Jabin of Hazor in Canaan, ...	20	
4. Judge—DEBORAH, }	40	
5. Judge—BARAK, }		
		— 206
SECOND PERIOD.—CH. VII.–X. 5.		
IV. *Servitude.*—Midian, Amalek, and children of the East, .	7	
6. Judge—GIDEON, ...	40	
Tyrant—Abimelech (as bad as a servitude), . .	3	
7. Judge—TOLA, ...	23	
8. Judge—JAIR, ...	22	
		— 95
THIRD PERIOD.—CH. X. 6–XII.		
V. *Servitude*—Ammonites, with Philistines, . . .	18	
9. Judge—JEPHTHAH, ...	6	
10. Judge—IBZAN, ...	7	
11. Judge—ELON, ...	10	
12. Judge—ABDON, ...	8	
		— 49
FOURTH PERIOD.—CH. XIII.–XVI.		
VI. *Servitude*—Philistines, ...	40	
13. Judge—SAMSON ("in the days of the Philistines," 20 years), ...	...	
		— 40
		In all, 390 years.

The division into these four periods is connected with the work of the judges, as extraordinary ministers in the theocracy, "saviours" raised up "to save the people," ii. 16, iii. 9, 15, etc.: for this typical saving work they were fitted by the fact that Jehovah "raised them up." Yet there are four times at which the Son of God, in His Old Testament character as the great Angel of the Covenant, came forth to reprove the people, or to give a special call to the judge who was

to save, ii. 1–5, vi. 11 ff., x. 10–16, xiii. 3–23; and connected with these four critical manifestations of His presence, four times the Spirit of the Lord is recorded to have come upon, or clothed, or moved the human instrument for saving Israel, iii. 10, vi. 34, xi. 29, xiii. 24–5. It is further in that article pointed out, how each of these four periods had its own character, the first being the most comprehensive, and the longest; how the reviving imparted grace at these critical dates seems to have spent itself always more and more quickly, each period being about half as long as its predecessor,—the fourth, however, being very peculiar, and deserving to be called anomalous in this respect, that the deliverance was so imperfect as to be insufficient for breaking the servitude which it lightened, until Samson's death accomplished what his life had failed to do. With this course which the manifested grace of God had run, the history of the book of Judges closes; but the opening chapters of 1st Samuel (which *Keil* erroneously thinks contemporaneous with the last of Judges) let us see the transition to a new form of the theocracy: first, the novel experiment of a union of offices in Eli, who was both high priest and judge; next, at the catastrophe which terminated his life and his feeble administration—the anarchy of twenty years; and then the career of Samuel, who united in himself the offices of prophet, priest, and judge. When his personal work was completed, and still the people were unsatisfied, the office of the judges was no longer suited to the wants of Israel, and the kingdom came into existence. But as the administrations of Eli and Samuel were novelties, which were chiefly important as steps in the transition to kingly government, their history is not recorded in the book of Judges.]

§ 49. *Date and Author.*

Since the book has proceeded from the hand of a single author (§ 48), and since the history not only brings us down to the death of Samson, but also gives the duration of the Philistines' oppression (xiii. 1), it cannot have been composed before their defeat by Samuel (1 Sam. vii. 1–14). [This statement may require slight modification if *Keil's* chronological scheme be rejected.] The texts xvii. 6, xviii. 1, xix. 1, xxi. 25, carry us a little further forward, since, according to them, Israel already had the advantages of the kingdom at the time the book was written. [With this *Bleek* coincides, p. 347; yet he thinks these advantages had not been long enjoyed, and that the clearness of the narrative, and the details given in the appendix, imply a

correct tradition, and its early assumption of a written form.] But, at the same time, i. 21 speaks of the Jebusites dwelling with the Benjamites in Jerusalem *unto this day;* from which we infer that the book must have been composed before the stronghold of Zion was taken and the Jebusites exterminated by David (2 Sam. v. 6 ff.), and therefore in the beginning of David's reign at the latest (1).

These accounts are also in harmony with the lively freshness of the narrative, and the extremely original style and language, which correspond to the powerful agency of the judges and heroes who were moved by the Spirit of God (2). The divergent opinions of other critics rest upon assumptions which are untenable (3).

(1) Comp. *Jahn*, ii. p. 189; *Häv.* pp. 87–8. The age of the book cannot be determined from the remaining passages in which the formula "unto this day" occurs, i. 26, vi. 24, x. 4, xv. 19, xix. 30.

(2) The Aramaisms in the song of Deborah—such as עָמְסִיר, v. 14; the plural termination יִן, ver. 10; דַּהֲרוֹת, ver. 22, etc.—are of a poetical nature; and the peculiarity of the preformative שׁ, v. 7, vi. 17, vii. 12, viii. 26, no more leads us to fix on a later age for the historical source employed in the accounts of Deborah and Gideon, than does that isolated phrase נָשִׁים נָשָׂא, xxi. 23, comp. Ruth i. 4. There is not a trace of anything such as marks decay in the later language.

(3) According to *Clericus*, *Eichhorn*, *Studer*, *Rosenmüller*, that designation of time, "until the day of the captivity of the land," must be referred to the exile of the ten tribes; according to *Bertheau*, p. 211, it must be the exile of the kingdom of Judah. But since this statement is determined more precisely at ver. 31, "all the time that the house of God was in Shiloh," the words in question must relate either to an event in the time of the judges, which is unknown to us, or to the carrying away of the ark by the Philistines; which latter is the view of *Hengstb.* Beitrr. ii. p. 153, *Häv.* p. 109 f., and *Welte* on *Herbst's* Einl. ii. 1, p. 124. [The correctness of this latter view scarcely admits of a doubt when a correct chronological scheme has placed Eli's administration immediately after Samson's victorious death. Then the political anarchy and the religious disorganization for twenty years after Eli's death, beginning with the loss of the ark, is an event of such prominence and importance as to merit this name, "the captivity of the land:" see 1 Sam. ii. 30–33, vii. 2, iv. 22; Ps. lxxviii. 59–64; 1 Chron. xvi. 34, 35. *Bleek*, pp. 347–8, thinks this captivity of the ark is meant by the author of the book of Judges; but he follows *Houbigant's* conjectural reading of הָאָרֹן for

הָאָרֶץ.] But the tabernacle was not at Shiloh "till the time of David" (*Bertheau*); under Saul it had already been removed to Nob, 1 Sam. xxi.: comp. *my* apolog. Versuch üb. d. Chronik, p. 393.—*Ewald's* view is, that a final composer and collector published the present books of Judges, Ruth, Samuel, and Kings, as one whole, in the latter half of the Babylonian exile; for which, however, the phrase נָתַן בְּיַד שֹׁסִים (ii. 14, 16, and 2 Kings xvii. 20) furnishes far too feeble a proof. According to *Bertheau*, p. xxxiii. f., the whole of the historical books, from Gen. i. to 2 Kings xxv., must have received their final form from some one not earlier than Ezra.

Now, if the composition of this book took place in the times of Samuel, the talmudical statement which makes Samuel the author might have greater probability than many other talmudical traditions (4).

(4) Comp. Baba bathra f. 14, 2; 15, 1. See the older opinions about the author in *Carpzov*, Introd. i. p. 172 sqq. Of the more recent scholars, *Jahn*, *ibid.*, and *Paulus*, exeg. Conserv. ii. p. 183, take Samuel to be the author; *Stähelin*, p. 105 ff., makes him the so-called Jehovist of the Pentateuch, to which view *De Wette* has already offered well-founded objections. [*Bleek*, p. 349, rejects entirely the view of *Studer*, that the book is of the age of Deuteronomy in the reign of Josiah, except the appendix, which he attributes to the time of the exile. *Bleek's* own view again, p. 345, is that in the places where the books of Joshua and Judges treat of the same matter, Judges is the older book.]

§ 50. *Sources of its Information, and its Historical Character.*

As the book comprehends a historical period of 350 years, the author can have drawn his materials only from written sources or from oral tradition. Against the latter supposition, and in favour of the former, there is a decided testimony in the historical precision of most parts of the book; and also the abundance of characteristic and original touches and expressions, which give a remarkable character to the extended delineations of the deeds of individual judges, and which partly distinguish them from one another (1).

(1) What *Häv.*, p. 83 ff., still has said against the supposition of written sources, seems to prove nothing at all. A time at which a lad accidentally picked up by Gideon can write, viii. 14, is no

longer to be classed with those simple times of patriarchal life that are contented with oral traditions of family legends.—The book certainly contains no quotations from written documents, but it just as little contains traces of a "noticeable colouring" which impress a legendary stamp upon it; nor yet such a progressive advance, that always the further the history proceeds, the more is related of it. Much rather, the deeds of Ehud, Barak, and Deborah are recorded with the same detailed precision as those of Gideon, Jephthah, and Samson; although the former are not equal to the latter in bulk or length, because they furnish fewer materials out of which to construct the narrative.—*Studer*, *Bertheau*, *Ewald*, and others were right in deciding that the book had been wrought up from written sources, however widely they have diverged when seeking to determine more nearly what these sources were. But (*a*) it is an untenable supposition that ancient annals were employed (see *Carpzov*, p. 172); or an ancient book of heroes, in which an honourable memorial was assigned to the bravest out of every tribe from the time preceding the introduction of the kingdom (*Studer*, p. 433; against which comp. *Häv.* p. 81, *Welte*, *ibid.* p. 129 f.). And (*b*) equally untenable is the hypothesis that the book originated from an ancient "introduction to the history of the kings," and two other elaborations of it (*Ewald*, Gesch. i. p. 186 ff., 216 ff.); or out of the fusion of a "catalogue of the twelve judges, in which the length of their administration and the place of their burial were given," which was discovered somewhere or other; and of "a historical work which described the time of the judges arranged in six generations, and reckoned to every generation a hero, who made an epoch in Israel's days of yore, his history filling up the space of a generation" (*Bertheau*, p. xxx. ff.). However, our author must have got possession of a badly damaged copy of this "catalogue of the twelve judges," since he has not given the place of burial of Othniel, Ehud, Shamgar, or Barak; nor in the case of the last three has he even mentioned the length of their administration, or their death! In § 48, Note 2, we have already remarked that the chronological statements in the book of Judges afford no support to this hypothesis.—In general, criticism can determine nothing further than this about the nature of the sources from which the writer has drawn his information, that a document which told how Israel's relations to the remaining Canaanite tribes took shape, which has been used also by the author of the book of Joshua, lies at the foundation of ch. i. and xvii.–xxi. [?]; also that the narratives of Deborah, Barak, and Gideon, probably the history of Samson too, are not extracted from the same documents as the accounts of the other judges, for which

there is evidence in the occurrence of the preformative יִ in ch. v.–viii. exclusively, and in the peculiar mode of designating the work of the Spirit of Jehovah upon the judges. Comp. § 47, Note 5.—No proof can be given of the supposition that there are two sources in ch. vi.–ix. (*Bertheau*) and in ch. xiii.–xvi. (*Jahn*, p. 191; *Rosenmüller*; against which comp. *Häv.* pp. 82–3).

The originality in matter and expression which beams forth from every one of the historical pictures, and the unmistakeable fidelity with which the political condition and the civil usages of the people of Israel in those times have been depicted, have so distinctly impressed a stamp of historical truth upon the book, that this is commonly conceded even by the scepticism of the modern criticism; although, in accordance with its dogmatic assumptions, this criticism rejects the miraculous features and the theocratic spirit as unhistorical legends and ingredients (2).

(2) To be sure, the spirit and the contents of the book are offensively disfigured by this very means, when its historical fidelity is praised at the expense of the Pentateuch and the book of Joshua, and when the attempt is made to separate the natural from the miraculous, the latter being rejected as a mythical veil. As to this, comp. *Häv.* p. 89 ff.—Only in reference to the genuineness of the song of Deborah, the destructive criticism has returned to the truth by little and little. *De Wette* no longer doubts its high antiquity; and *Ewald*, *Böttcher*, and *Bertheau* agree with *Kalkar* and *Kemink* in acknowledging its genuineness.

THE BOOKS OF SAMUEL (שְׁמוּאֵל).

Commentaries:—*Casp. Sanctius*, *Melanchthon*, *Bugenhagen*, *Brentius*, *V. Strigel*, *Seb. Schmidt*, *J. A. Osiander*, *Drusius*, *Clericus*, *Maurer*; see § 224 sq. *Hensler*, Erläutt. des 1 B. Sam. u. der Salom. Denksprüche, Hamburg 1795. *J. P. F. Königsfeldt*, annotatt. in poster. lib. Sam. et prior lib. Chron. synoptice expositos, Havniæ 1839. *Chr. H. Kalkar*, quæstionum biblic. specim. ii. (de nonnullis prioris Sam. libri locis, qui interpolati esse dicuntur), Othin. 1835. *O. Thenius*, d. BB. Samuel erklärt, Leipzig 1842 (Part iv. of the kurzgefasst. Exeget. Handbuch). [*Keil's* own Commentary on Samuel, in the series edited by him and *Delitzsch*, was published in 1864.]

§ 51. *Name, Division, Contents, and Object.*

These books formed originally one whole, as among the Jews they still do, which was divided into two by the Septuagint and Vulgate (1). They take their name from Samuel, not as their author, but in respect of their contents, as the principal person in the history of the period which they embrace; for not only did he preside over the theocracy whilst he held the office of judge, but he also anointed Saul and David to be kings, and he exercised an important influence upon their government. Hence this appellation, *à potiori*, designates the peculiarity of the contents better than "1st and 2d Kingdoms, or Kings," which is the title they bear in the Septuagint and the Vulgate (2).

(1) *Origen*, in *Euseb.* hist. eccl. vi. 25, Βασιλειῶν πρώτη, δευτέρα, παρ' αὐτοῖς ἓν Σαμουὴλ ὁ θεόκλητος. *Cyrill. Hieros.* Cateches. iv. 34. *Jerome* in prolog. galeat. Following the Septuagint and Vulgate, *Dan. Bomberg* introduced the division into two books into our Hebrew Bibles.

(2) *Abarbanel*, præf. commentar. in libr. Sam. f. 74, in *Carpzov*, p. 212: "quod quæ in utroque libro occurrunt, omnia ad Samuelem certo modo referri possunt, etiam Saulis ac Davidis gesta, quia uterque a Samuele unctus opus veluti manuum ejus fuerint." It does not follow from the Alexandrian name for the book, "1st and 2d books of Kingdoms (βασιλειῶν)," and that in the Vulgate, "1st and 2d books of Kings," that the Hebrew title originated later (*Bertholdt*, p. 891); for these translators may also have altered the older name (*Häv.* p. 119). [*Bleek*, p. 355, notices that some of the Latin Fathers use the title "Kingdoms."]

The history of the theocracy begins with the high-priesthood of Eli, yet really it is taken up where it was broken off in the book of Judges, namely, in the time of the Philistine supremacy (3), and it is carried forward to the end of the reign of David. Consequently the contents may be divided so as to fall into three great sections: —*First*, The restoration of the entirely sunken theocracy, and its guidance by Samuel (1 Sam. i.–xii.). *Second*, The history of the kingdom of Saul, from his accession till his death (1 Sam. xiii.–xxxi.). *Third*, The reign of David (2 Sam. i.–xxiv.) (4).

(3) The narrative of Eli's high-priesthood serves merely as an introduction to the history of Samuel, setting in a clear light the fact that he was chosen to be a prophet of the Lord. There is no gap in the history between the books of Judges and 1st Samuel (*De Wette*, § 177). Eli's high-priesthood, together with the consecration and call of Samuel, falls within the times of the Philistine supremacy, from which Samson began during twenty years to deliver Israel, though Samuel was the first who entirely saved the theocracy; comp. my Abhandlung in the *Dorpat.* theol. Beitrr. ii. p. 350 ff. [Also look back to the additional matter at the end of § 48 for a different view.]

(4) The *first section*, in 1st Samuel, contains: (*a*) Samuel's birth, consecration, and call, ch. i.–iii.; (*b*) The loss of the ark, its restoration, Samuel's agency as judge, and his victory over the Philistines, ch. iv.–vii.; (*c*) Longing of the Israelites for a king; the anointing, election, and confirmation of Saul to be king; and Samuel's farewell address to the people, ch. viii.–xii. The *second section* contains: 1. The history of the reign of Saul till his rejection: (*a*) His first enterprise against the Philistines, and victory over them by means of Jonathan, ch. xiii.–xiv. 46; (*b*) His other wars and victories, his children and relatives, xiv. 47–52; (*c*) His disobedience in the war with Amalek, and his rejection, ch. xv. 2. History of Saul after his rejection, till his death: (*a*) Anointing of David to be king, his playing on the harp before Saul, his victory over Goliath, and his subsequent relation to Saul and Jonathan, ch. xvi.–xviii.; (*b*) David a fugitive from Saul's presence, ch. xix.–xxvii.; (*c*) What Saul last undertook, and how he fell in the war with the Philistines; David's fortunes and enterprises during his sojourn in Philistia, ch. xxviii.–xxxi. The *third section*, in 2d Samuel, narrates: 1. David's advancement to be king over Judah: (*a*) His mourning over the death of Saul and Jonathan, ch. i.; (*b*) His return into the land of Israel, and his anointing to be king over the house of Judah in Hebron; Ishbosheth's advancement by means of Abner to be king over Israel, and the struggle between the house of Saul and the house of David, ch. ii.; (*c*) Abner's going over to David, the murder of Ishbosheth, and the anointing of David to be king over Israel, ch. iii.–v. 5. 2. David's reign with increasing power and glory: (*a*) Establishment of a permanent residence, and victory over the Philistines, ch. v. 6–25; (*b*) Arrangement of the public worship of God, and confirmation of his kingdom by God, ch. vi. vii.; (*c*) Conquest of all external enemies, the officers of the king, his kindness shown to Mephibosheth, ch. viii. ix. 3. His reign overcast: (*a*) By his adultery during the war

with Ammon and Syria, ch. x.–xii.; (*b*) By the wickedness of his sons, Amnon's incest and Absalom's rebellion, ch. xiii.–xix.; (*c*) By the revolt of Sheba, ch. xx. 4. The remaining events of his reign: (*a*) The famine, and the war with the Philistines, ch. xxi.; (*b*) David's song of thanksgiving, and his last words, ch. xxii.–xxiii. 7; (*c*) Catalogue of his mighty men, and the numbering of the people, ch. xxiii. 8–xxiv. Comp. § 52, Note 2.

The object of the book is not, by bringing forward a king as he should not be, namely Saul, and again the beau-ideal of a king of Israel, namely David, to furnish a mirror for rulers. In reality, it is to depict the course of development of the theocracy from the end of the period of the judges till the end of the reign of David—its deliverance from the deepest humiliation under the Philistine yoke, and its victorious elevation to dominion over all external enemies, by the genuine theocratic agency of Samuel and David. This is described almost with the copiousness of a biography; for this simple reason, that these men were the instruments chosen by the Lord and endowed with His Spirit to restore the theocracy, which was deeply sunken by the apostasy of the people from their divine King, to fortify it externally and internally, and to carry forward its secular and spiritual culture. And the life and leadership of each of them furnishes a rich treasure of instruction for believers in every age (5).

(5) "Est in his libris tanta vis et copia exemplorum, quibus nunc veritas divinarum promissionum comprobatur, nunc certitudo divinarum minarum declaratur, nunc judicia in impios manifestantur, nunc misericordia Dei in credentes ostentatur, ut vix fieri possit, quin studiose legendo, aut lectorem ac interpretem diligenter audiendo, ab impietate non deterrearis, et ad pietatem non inviteris, aut antea invitatus non confirmeris."—*Brentii*, homil., in *Carpzov*, p. 222.

§ 52. *Composition and Unity of the Book.*

Although the contents of the books of Samuel have been extracted from several historical sources, and though the narrative is here and there very brief and like a chronicle, yet in most of the sections is so copious as to assume the character of a biography; nevertheless its composition gives no indication of its being a compilation of such a sort that the constituent parts, brought together from various sources,

are united only loosely and inexactly (1). The various sections do not stand in it isolated and unconnected, nor are they mutually contradictory, nor do they deliver double reports of the same events such as to some extent exclude one another. On the contrary, even when they are so rounded off, each by itself, as to form distinct historical groups of the individual stages in the historical development of the theocracy under Samuel, Saul, and David; still the groups, viewed as a whole, are united in an internal unity by mutual references (2). And the alleged contradictions are only apparent, and are not hard to reconcile (3); while the duplicate narratives are partly simple repetitions, such as are natural to the genius of Shemitic historical composition, and are partly narratives of events really quite different, though resembling one another, such as occur everywhere in history under similar conditions (4).

(1) As *Bertholdt*, p. 892 ff.; *De Wette*, § 179; *Gramberg*, Religionsideen, ii. p. 71 ff.; *C. H. Graf*, de librorum Sam. et Regg. compositione, scriptoribus, fide histor., etc., dissert. crit., Argentorati 1842; *Stähelin*, in *Tholuck's* litt. Anzeiger 1838, p. 526, and in his own krit. Unterss. p. 112 ff., 129 ff.; and *Thenius*, d. BB. Sam. p. xv. ff., assert.

(2) *Thenius* discovers the "concluding remarks" of individual constituent parts in 1 Sam. vii. 15–17, xiv. 47–52; 2 Sam. viii. 15–18, xx. 23–26. These passages indeed are of a comprehensive and concluding nature; yet they do not prove "that the several writers comprehended briefly in them what still was known to them in separate details about the persons whose history they were noting down." In 1 Sam. vii. 15–17, after the account of the liberation from the Philistine yoke, we certainly are informed that Samuel judged Israel all the days of his life, that he annually went in circuit through the land, and that his house was at Ramah. Yet it is shown at once, by the opening words of ch. viii., that there was no intention of concluding the history of his life and work: "And it came to pass, when Samuel was old, that he made his sons judges over Israel," etc.; this statement forming the introduction to the next section, Samuel's choice of Saul to be king. There is not a trace of vii. 15–17 containing any reference to Samuel's *end*. Only the period during which the judges ruled over Israel is concluded in ch. vii.; and with ch. viii. begins the founding of the kingdom, and its history.—Just as little is the history of Saul's reign brought to an end at xiv. 52: for vers. 47–52 give merely a summary characterizing his govern-

ment; to which summary are annexed the fifteenth and following chapters, being the narrative of his rejection, which forms the turning-point of his royalty; so that ch. viii.–xiv. form the first section of it, and ch. xv.–xxxi. the second.—So also, 2 Sam. viii. 15–18 do not form the conclusion of any document about David's government: they only mark the point of time at which it had reached its zenith, so as to attach to it a series of events showing the other side—the narrative of his sin, and of the many heavy sufferings which burst forth from it upon his house (x.–xx.); while ch. ix. is interposed as the transition from the first section to the second.—Finally, ch. xxi.–xxiv. form the third section, in which are brought together the remaining important events and documents of David's government, in order to complete the work.—The following inferences of *Thenius* are entirely erroneous: from 1 Sam. ix. 6, that the author of this chapter had known nothing of Samuel acting as judge; and from 1 Sam. xiv. 47, that the author of this section had known nothing of Saul being chosen by lot, or of his kingdom being confirmed at Gilgal. The former inference is refuted by ix. 11–13; the latter falls to the ground along with the inadmissible rendering of לָכַד (xiv. 47), "Thus Saul came to the kingdom."

(3) Of contradictions, *De Wette* and *Thenius* give prominence to the following:—(*a.*) "According to 1 Sam. vii. 13, Samuel had given the Philistines a thorough disgust at coming any more into the coast of Israel; whereas, according to ix. 16, x. 5, xiii. 3, 9, 20, they still held Israel in subjection during his lifetime." But vii. 13 does not speak of an expulsion of the Philistines for all time coming. It is only said, "So the Philistines were subdued, and they came no more into the coast of Israel; and the hand of Jehovah was against the Philistines all the days of Samuel;" and this does not preclude the possibility of their regaining power to subjugate Israel some fifteen or twenty years later, so that Saul should be designated to become prince and deliverer of Israel from their hand, and should wage sore war with them throughout the whole of his reign (xiv. 52).

(*b.*) "In the history of Saul, xiii. 8 points back to x. 8; but it no more agrees with xi. 14, 15, than ix. 1–x. 16, where Samuel anoints Saul in virtue of a divine revelation, agrees with viii., x. 17–27, where he has him elected king by lot in consequence of the popular demand" (*De Wette*). But is then the divine instruction to Samuel to grant the people their demands and to give them a king (viii.), and the revelation that Saul was the man destined for this by Jehovah, together with the anointing of Saul (ix. 1–x. 16), anyhow irreconcilable with the selection of him by lot? *Thenius'* reasons for inferring

that the two facts would be inconceivable, p. 37—namely, that then the prophet would either have tempted God, or else would have been guilty of an unworthy piece of jugglery in presence of the people—may very well have weight in a school of criticism that denies not only the inspiration of the prophets, but also any living working of God upon the free actions of men; but they have no power to throw doubt upon the truth of the facts recorded in the divine revelation. That a prophet should carry out unconditionally the will of God, even when it does not correspond with his subjective views, and should leave it to God's disposal to decide how the lot was to fall, involved neither a tempting of God nor a piece of jugglery.—The other "contradiction," between xi. 14, 15 and xiii. 8 compared with x. 8, from which *Thenius* infers that xiii. 2 ff. had followed x. 16 immediately in the original document, and had become separated from it only by later interpolations of traditions about Saul derived from other sources, proceeds upon the supposition that xiii. 8 makes "the most decided reference to x. 8;" that is to say, that the seven days mentioned in xiii. 8 are that period which Samuel in x. 8 commanded Saul to wait. But this supposition is manifestly unfounded. If those seven days in xiii. 8 were identical with the appointed space of seven days in x. 8, then no time would be left for what in xiii. 2–7 was accomplished by Saul, on this supposition, within those seven days. How could Saul within that space of time assemble the people of Israel around him, out of them select 3000 men, 2000 of them being retained beside himself at Michmash and on Mount Bethel, and 1000 being handed over to Jonathan, by whom the garrison of the Philistines at Geba was smitten; after which this feat of arms was trumpeted through the whole land, and the people were called together to the king at Gilgal? Yet *Thenius* assumes this, pp. 46, 47. And, without going into particulars, how could Saul, when he had been only secretly anointed by Samuel, and while he concealed this anointing even from his uncle (x. 1 and 16), attain to such respect and consideration, that all Israel came round him in troops as they might do round their king, at a time when as yet he had neither been proclaimed king by Samuel, nor had done any deed whatever as the king to gain the confidence of the people? His meeting a company of prophets as he went away from Samuel to Gibeah, and prophesying, and becoming a proverb, is in no way sufficient to explain what is told in xiii. 1–7: for this the events recorded in x. 17–xii. 25 are so emphatically demanded, that we should unavoidably pronounce a document seriously defective in which xiii. 2 was annexed immediately to x. 16. But from this it manifestly follows, that the instruction given by Samuel to Saul to

go to Gilgal, and there to wait seven days, etc., refers to what is recorded in xi. 14, 15 of Saul's being solemnly proclaimed king, and that in this proceeding the instruction was realized, and that the account in xiii. 8, "And he waited seven days, according to the time that Samuel had appointed," stands in no relation to x. 8; but that at a later time, long after Saul had been proclaimed king in Gilgal by Samuel and the whole people, Samuel had appointed that he should go to Gilgal, with reference to the Philistine war, in order to entreat the help of the Lord against the Philistines when he offered there a burnt-offering and various intercessory offerings (xiii. 11, 12). We have no special notice of this instruction given by Samuel: it is intimated only incidentally by לַמּוֹעֵד אֲשֶׁר שְׁמוּאֵל, xiii. 8, as long ago *Clericus* rightly understood; whereas *Seb. Schmidt* and others, as also *Ewald*, Geschichte, ii. p. 474, holding that supposition in combination with the newer one, are driven to the inadmissible assumption that x. 8 ought to be taken as a direction for all cases, "quotiescunque Saulus rem magni momenti suscepturus erat." We may see how inadmissible the identification of xiii. 8 with x. 8 is, even from this, that according to x. 8 we have עֹלוֹת in the plural, but in ch. xiii. it is a single burnt-offering, הָעוֹלָה, which is said to be offered; and further, that Samuel does not say, "I am come solemnly to invest thee with the royal dignity" (*Thenius*), but gives the explanation, "Now would Jehovah have established thy kingdom upon Israel for ever; but now thy kingdom shall not continue," vers. 13, 14. [In his commentary on Samuel, *Keil* has more recently expressed a different opinion. He no longer refers ch. x. 8 to xi. 14, because Samuel on that occasion expressly called the assembled people to proceed with him to Gilgal, so that Saul could not have to wait for him. And he translates ch. x. 8 conditionally, "And shouldst thou go down before me to Gilgal," etc.,—an unlikely eventuality: he objects to the idea of Samuel commanding Saul to do this, just after the liberty he had given him in ver. 7.]

(*c.*) "Ch. xiv. 47–52 is distinguished by brevity such as befits a chronicle; and the writer knows nothing of either x. 17 ff., xi. 14 f., or of ch. xv." But the brevity of a chronicle is perfectly suitable for the summary conclusion of Saul's administration which these verses contain. We cannot infer that the passages, x. 17 ff., etc., were unknown, either from the facts narrated in them not being repeated, or from the expression וְשָׁאוּל לָבַד. *Thenius*' paraphrase of this, "Thus Saul came to the kingdom; after this first great feat of arms he conducted himself as the king whom Samuel had anointed" (not to speak of what it arbitrarily thrusts into the text), is repelled as even gram-

matically inadmissible, since the imperfect tense with ו relative would be required for such a sequence of thought.

(*d.*) "According to 1 Sam. xvi. 14–23, David was already Saul's armour-bearer, and his family connections were known to the king: but at xvii. 15 David keeps at a distance at the very time when he should have been at Saul's side as his armour-bearer; at ver. 33 he appears as a herd-boy who is a stranger to the profession of arms; at ver. 28 as one who was not entitled to be a spectator of the war; and, more surprising still, at ver. 55 ff. as unknown alike to Abner and to the king" (*Winer*, Realwörterbuch, i. 259, with *Bertholdt*, *De Wette*, *Thenius*, and others). But although, on account of his playing on the harp, David came to the court of Saul and was named his armour-bearer, yet his proper office at that time was not to carry arms in war, but to soothe the evil spirit of the king by his playing; so that we cannot be surprised at the king permitting him to return home, where he again fed his father's sheep as formerly, while the king himself went to the war, having with him several armour-bearers whom he had put to the proof in previous wars (comp. *Kalkar*, specim. ii. p. 5 sq.). But hitherto David had furnished no proof of warlike valour; and in general, he had not yet taken part as a combatant in any war. According to this, the words of Saul, xvii. 33, do not surprise us; whilst those of David's elder brother, ver. 28, the inspiration of pride and wounded ambition, cannot in the remotest degree throw suspicion on the narrative in ch. xvi.—The surprising circumstance that, according to xvii. 55 ff., Saul asks Abner, the captain of his host, about the pedigree of the conqueror of Goliath, is indeed satisfactorily explained neither by an unusual forgetfulness which was connected with the unhealthy state of the hypochondriac king (*Bertholdt*); nor by the bustle of court life and the multitude of persons coming daily into the presence of kings, who often scarcely know their faces (*Saurin*, discours histor., etc., in *Kalkar*, p. 22); nor by the ingratitude natural to men of the world, "ut nimirum magnates et principes viri opera minorum utantur, sed ne ipsis aliquid debere et devincti esse videantur, statim eorum memoriam elabi sinant" (*Calvin*): and still less can Saul's question, "Whose son is this youth?" be taken as an expression of contempt, with *Häv.* p. 136. But it is either the expression of wondering astonishment, so that the king for an instant loses his way about the personality of his harper, from whom he has no expectation of such a deed; or, what is still more probable, the question supposes ignorance, not of David's *person*, but of his family connections, which the king might easily forget, and Abner might never have known. These connections Saul now desired to know

with precision and certainty, because the family of the conqueror of Goliath had been promised immunity from taxation (xvii. 25), for which object he needed to know more about David's origin than merely his father's name and his place of birth. It is true that David's answer, ver. 58, tells no more than this; but the answer has not been given in full, as comes out clearly from what is said, xviii. 1, "And it came to pass, when he had made an end of speaking unto Saul" (so also *Welte* on *Herbst's* Einl. ii. p. 160 f.). [It might be simplest of all to suppose that xvi. 14–23 narrates at once and uninterruptedly, for the sake of finishing one subject before beginning another, all the steps which were taken in consequence of Saul's terrible malady; although in order of time, as a mere annalist might have felt bound to relate the circumstances, David had indeed been heard of and selected to become Saul's harper, but the war with the Philistines had broken out and interrupted the arrangements, very probably had also for the time relieved Saul's mind in virtue of the excitement,—so that David did not actually enter on his duties as harper till after the victory over Goliath; and xvi. 21–23 synchronizes with xviii. 1–5. Such a meeting of two lines of providential occurrences at a critical period in the history of David has parallels in Scripture, as well as in the uninspired history of the Church. And such a narrative of an entire transaction without interruption from another, which chronologically should have been set down in the middle of it, may be suspected in many cases, as Gen. xxxviii., in order not to interfere with the history of Joseph; and it is seen beyond the possibility of misapprehension in the account of the cleansing of the temple by our Lord, and His curse upon the barren fig-tree, Matt. xxi. 10–23, compared with Mark xi. 11–27.] That the writer of xvii. 55–xviii. 5 was quite well acquainted with the preceding narrative, xvi. 14 ff.; also that ch. xvii. contains no new document irreconcilable with the preceding one, is shown incontestably by the words, xviii. 2, "And Saul took him that day, and would let him no more go home to his father's house," referring to xvii. 15, "But David went and returned from Saul to feed his father's sheep at Bethlehem,"—a remark which presupposes the narrative in xvi. 14–23, like the expression "that Ephrathite" (xvii. 12), and which is without any good reason alleged to be an interpolation by the person who wrought up the narratives. Accordingly, there is also no reason, with *Kennicott*, *Michaelis*, *Dathe*, *Eichhorn*, and others, to strike out xvii. 12–31 and 54–xviii. 5, and some other single verses, as being spurious or interpolated. For the absence of xvii. 11–31 and 55–58 in the [Vatican copy of the] Septuagint proves nothing, considering

how arbitrary its criticism is; and the repetition of the notice about Jesse's sons (xvii. 12 comp. with xvi. 6 ff.) belongs to the peculiar discursiveness and circumstantiality of Shemitic historical composition (comp. *Ewald*, Kompos. d. Genes. p. 148 ff.); [see more as to this at the beginning of Note 4]. And the remaining improbabilities and contradictions are easily settled. That is to say, the assertion that David could not have brought the head of Goliath to Jerusalem (xvii. 54), because this city was not then in the possession of Israel, is in contradiction to the history; since, according to Josh. xv. 63 and Judg. i. 21, Jerusalem was inhabited by Israelites much earlier than the stronghold Jebus was. [Nor can there be any improbability proved to exist in the supposition that the head of so extraordinary an enemy was preserved, perhaps by embalming, and was finally brought to Jerusalem after it had become David's capital. Compare what follows as to the preservation of another trophy.] The laying of Goliath's armour in David's tent is not in the least at variance with the circumstance that we find the sword of Goliath at a later time in the sanctuary at Nob (xxi. 9), as xvii. 54 does not say that David kept it for ever in his tent (comp. *Kalkar*, p. 18 sqq.). Finally, a disfiguring of the simple and well-connected narrative is the only foundation for the assertion of *Thenius*, that according to xviii. 2, 5, after the victory over Goliath, Saul retained David beside him out of affection for him, and set him over the men of war after several successful expeditions; but, on the contrary, that, according to vers. 9, 10, he regarded him with a jealous eye from the first moment onwards, and even attempted his life the day after they returned from the battle. According to that narrative itself, immediately after the victory over Goliath, Saul took David to himself, and let him return no more to his father's house; but soon after, on returning from the war, he fretted himself so much on account of the triumph which was given to David on this occasion by the people, that from that day forward he regarded David with a jealous eye, and in a fit of madness the next day threw a spear at him; and in the end he removed him from his immediate presence by making him captain over a thousand men, for he feared him on account of his good fortune. Comp. further, *Kalkar*, p. 24 sqq.

(*c*.) "The account in 2 Sam. iii. 14 (100 foreskins) contradicts the earlier one in 1 Sam. xviii. 27 (200 foreskins)" (*De Wette*). It agrees perfectly with 1 Sam. xviii. 25, according to which Saul had demanded only 100. Of this David avails himself in dealing with Ishbosheth, because he had here to do only with the price demanded, and not with the circumstance that David had actually brought the

double. [In fact, the truthfulness of the narrative is confirmed by David's delicacy, in making no allusion in an official transaction to a private matter, which simply bore testimony to his own valour and generosity.]

(*f.*) "Ch. xix. 2 ff. is contradicted by xx. 2, where Jonathan's answer, as well as David's remark, ver. 7, appears entirely unsuitable after the incidents recorded in xix. 2 ff.; and after what he had lived through, David could never think of finding himself at the royal table as formerly (ver. 5 ff.), and still less could Saul expect this to happen" (comp. ver. 26 ff.). So *Thenius* on xx. 1, and *De Wette*. But even though Jonathan knew what had occurred, yet a son's innate confidence in his father's goodness of heart might instil the hope that his father had acted so to David in a mere fit of madness, and with returning reason, would not cherish a deadly hatred to him in his heart. In this hope that his father meant well, which rested on his own view of his father's character, he was confirmed the more by the fact that his father had done nothing great or small (the *perfect* being the true reading, and the *future*, which *Thenius* prefers, being a bad emendation) without communicating it to him; whence he inferred that he would also not conceal from him his intention to kill David, in case he had decidedly resolved on this. If we consider, in addition, that in the meantime Jonathan may have been labouring to reconcile them (*Hess*), David might regard such a reconciliation with Saul as a possibility, though scarcely a probability, judging from his words, xx. 1, 3, 5–7.—Even Saul's expectation, that David would come to the royal table on the feast of the new moon, is conceivable in this way. On former occasions, David had experienced similar attacks of rage from the royal madman, and had been reconciled afterwards through the intervention of Jonathan, and had forgotten all that had occurred (ch. xviii. and xix.); and besides, Saul in his blindness expected too much from the confidence and obedience of David, believing, as soon as each repeated outbreak of madness was over, that he had concealed the evil thoughts of his heart from the people around him, and even that he had prosecuted his attempts to apprehend David under pretence of something entirely different.

(*g.*) "Ch. xxi. 10 ff., where David flees as a suppliant to Achish, whose servants suspect him, so that he feigns madness, and xxiii. 1–5, David's expedition against the Philistines, contradict the later account, xxvii. 2 ff., where he takes up his abode with Achish, and receives Ziklag as a fief from him, and with xxix. 1 ff., where the lords of the Philistines likewise (?) suspect him" (*De Wette*). But this supposed contradiction arises entirely from the supposition that the first flight

to Achish, on which occasion he feigned madness to save his life, is only a distorted tradition of his second flight to this king; and this supposition is at once refuted as untrue by Ps. xxxiv., which confirms the historical truth of 1 Sam. xxi. 11 ff.

(*h.*) Finally, in the narratives, 2 Sam. viii. and x.–xii., not even *Thenius* (on ch. x.) finds sufficient reason for considering them two different reports of the war against the Syrians. In reference to the rest of the contradictions held to be real by *De Wette*, and especially by *Gramberg*, comp. *Häv.* p. 139 ff., and *Thenius*, p. xvi.—Many of them were also put forward by *Spinoza*, *Bayle*, and *Hobbes*, whom *Carpzov*, p. 213 sqq., seeks to refute.

(4) The double mention of Samuel's death, 1 Sam. xxv. 1 and xxviii. 3 (there being a necessity for recalling it to recollection in this latter place, to make the narrative intelligible), is due to the simplicity of Shemitic historical composition, in which the occurrence of repetitions is a formal peculiarity; compare *Ewald*, Kompos. der Genes. p. 144 ff. The double mention of Goliath, 1 Sam. xvii. 4 and 2 Sam. xxi. 19, has its foundation in a corruption of the latter text, as is shown by the parallel passage, 1 Chron. xx. 5; comp. *Winer*, bibl. R.W. i. 438, and *Thenius*, on this passage.—The remaining passages are erroneously alleged to be duplicate accounts. Thus, 1 Sam. xviii. 10 f. and xix. 9 f. For there is nothing impossible, nor even improbable, in Saul's throwing his spear at David in two different fits of madness, as David was playing before him to soothe his melancholy, and in David's being so fortunate as to escape both times: especially when we consider, first, that the consequences to David of these two attacks of madness were very different, and that Saul afterwards threw his spear at his own son Jonathan (xx. 33); and secondly, that the direct contradiction which *Thenius* discovers between xviii. 2, 5 and xviii. 9, 10, is based exclusively upon an erroneous identification of בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא in ver. 2 with מִמָּחֳרַיִם הַהוּא in ver. 9.—Still less are 1 Sam. xiii. 14 and xv. 26 ff. to be identified as double accounts of the same event: they are the accounts of a first and a second act of disobedience on the part of Saul to the commandment of Jehovah revealed to him by Samuel. The former transgression, for which Saul might offer an apology on account of the pressure of circumstances, drew after it the threat, "But now thy kingdom shall not continue: Jehovah hath sought Him a man after His own heart, and Jehovah hath commanded him to be captain over His people, because thou hast not kept that which Jehovah commanded thee" (1 Sam. xiii. 14). Yet it contains no immediate rejection of Saul; it might not be fulfilled till his death. The sentence passed on the latter transgression is diffe-

rent, since here Saul could plead no reason for his rebellion against the command of God (1 Sam. xv.). Therefore Jehovah made this revelation to Samuel, ver. 11: "It repenteth me that I have set up Saul to be king; for he is turned back from following me, and hath not performed my commandments." And Samuel was so agitated by this revelation, that he cried unto Jehovah all night; and he not only revealed it to Saul, "Because thou hast rejected the word of Jehovah, He hath also rejected thee from being king" (vers. 23 and 26), but also from that time forward he withdrew entirely from Saul, and came no more to see him until the day of his death. For "Samuel mourned for Saul, and Jehovah repented that He had made Saul king over Israel" (ver. 35). It was not till this second act of disobedience that Saul forfeited his kingdom irrecoverably.—The mention twice of the proverb, "Is Saul also among the prophets?" is to be thus explained: The first time we read of the origin of the proverb (1 Sam. x. 10–12, "Therefore it *became* a proverb"); the second time a similar case is related, by which the old proverb was verified and confirmed (1 Sam. xix. 24, "Wherefore they say").

Finally, as to the assumption that 1 Sam. xxvi. contains only another version of xxiii. 19–xxiv. 23, *Thenius*, on ch. xxvi., assigns weight to "the agreement of both accounts in essentials," together with the assurance that "Saul must have been a moral monster if he persecuted David with cool consideration, and by the same agents, seeking again the life of the man who had so magnanimously given him his." But Saul remains "a moral monster" still, when, after David had thus spared his life once, he does not cease to hunt him through the whole territory of Israel, so that David is compelled to flee to the Philistines (xxvii. 1). And this very ch. xxvii., which is ascribed to the same source as ch. xxiv. by *Thenius* himself, shows that Saul's repentance (xxiv. 17 ff.) was very short-lived, and that he soon went forth again to the persecution of David. And "the essential agreement" of ch. xxvi. with xxiii. 19–xxiv. 23 is reduced to this: first, the Ziphites twice betray to the king David's abode in the neighbourhood of their forest, in the hill of Hachilah; and next, David twice spares the life of the king, whom he might have destroyed. But the consequences of these two acts of treachery are very different, and so are the minuter details of the two cases of sparing Saul. By the first piece of treachery, *David* and his men were brought into such danger on a mountain in the *wilderness of Maon*, that he was already surrounded by Saul and his men, and was delivered only by the intelligence of a Philistine invasion of the land, which compelled Saul suddenly to give up the pursuit of David, and to march against

the Philistines (xxiii. 25–28). By the second piece of treachery it was *Saul* who was brought into circumstances in which David might have killed him, upon the *hill of Hachilah*, as David and Abishai in the night-time went into Saul's camp when every one was asleep, and took away the spear and the cruse of water at the king's head. Then, this second magnanimous sparing the life of his mortal enemy by David took place on the *hill of Hachilah, in the midst of Saul's camp;* whereas the first took place in the wilderness of *Engedi, in a cave*, into which Saul had gone to cover his feet, while David and his adherents were hidden in the interior of the cave, without Saul suspecting it (xxiv. 1 ff.). Finally, it is true that these two events, which are entirely different in respect of locality and points of essential moment, are alike in this, that David twice resisted the wrong desire of his people to kill Saul, or let him be killed, refusing to stretch forth his hand against the Lord's anointed; and that both times Saul manifested a momentary repentance when he learned from David what had occurred. Yet again, even in these points of resemblance, there are differences which show themselves upon closer comparison — differences so characteristic, and so entirely suitable to the circumstances of each case, that a legend never could have given rise to them. Saul was so much touched when his life was spared the first time, that he wept aloud, declared that David was more righteous than himself, etc., and made him swear that when he came to the throne he would not cut off his (Saul's) seed (xxiv. 17–22). On the second occasion he manifestly appears much more hardened; though he still makes confession that he has erred and played the fool exceedingly, and says he will no more do David harm, and must even allow that David "shall do great things, and shall still prevail." Not less different and peculiar are the words of David on the two occasions, notwithstanding their agreement in some of the thoughts; comp. xxiv. 10–16 with xxvi. 18–20, 22–24.

The unity of our books is confirmed, too, by their language, which continues the same throughout, and which, though it has many points of agreement with the language of the older books, has also many new expressions which are entirely awanting in them (5). There is no foundation for the assertion that two different styles of language are to be found in them (6).

(5) For instance, "Jehovah of hosts," 1 Sam. i. 3, 11, iv. 4, and often; "the inheritance of Jehovah," as a designation of the people of Israel, 1 Sam. xxvi. 19, 2 Sam. xx. 19, xxi. 3; "God do so," or

"Jehovah do so," 1 Sam. iii. 17, xiv. 44, xx. 13, and often; מַלְכוּת, 1 Sam. xx. 31, like 1 Kings ii. 12, and often in the later books; "the ears shall tingle," 1 Sam. iii. 11, 2 Kings xxi. 12, Jer. xix. 3; and others also.

(6) What *Stähelin*, krit. Unterss. p. 112 ff., considers of value in proof of this has been already refuted by *De Wette*, Einl. pp. 227–8: partly by the remark that affinity with Jehovistic and Deuteronomic passages is a proof, not of identity of authorship, but only of acquaintance with earlier books; partly by a hint to this effect, that several of the marks alleged by *Stähelin* are common to both of his assumed sources of the present work. Such are "Jehovah of hosts," also in 1 Sam. xv. 2; "The inheritance of Jehovah," also in 1 Sam. x. 1; בְּפַעַם בְּפַעַם, 1 Sam. iii. 10, xx. 25, also Judg. xx. 30, 31, which chapter is said to be distinguished essentially from the Jehovistic source; תְּצָלָה רוּחַ יי, 1 Sam. xi. 6, also x. 10, xvi. 13, xviii. 10; חַי יְהוָה, 1 Sam. xx. 3, 21, xxvi. 10, 16, xxviii. 10, yet also xiv. 39, 45, xix. 6, xxv. 26, 34, etc. Other expressions do not occur elsewhere, only because the thing itself is not mentioned again; for instance, אַשְׁכֻּרָה, 1 Sam. xi. 11, Ex. xiv. 24, Judg. vii. 19; or even they are not the same in the alleged parallels,—as לֹא הִפִּיל מִכָּל־דְּבָרָיו אַרְצָה, 1 Sam. iii. 19, with Josh. xxi. 45, xxiii. 14, לֹא נָפַל דָּבָר without אַרְצָה, etc.

§ 53. *Date and Author.*

The books of Samuel have not the same author as the books of Kings (1); the former belong to a much earlier age. The circumstance that they embrace a period of 100 years and more is unfavourable to the supposition that the composition was contemporary with the occurrence of the events (2). This argument is confirmed by the fact that explanations are given of expressions and customs belonging to the times of Samuel and David (1 Sam. ix. 9; 2 Sam. xiii. 18), and by the formula "unto this day," in 1 Sam. v. 5, vi. 18, xxx. 25, 2 Sam. iv. 3, vi. 8, xviii. 18 (3); although these circumstances do not furnish any sure data for determining the time of composition. From the notice in 1 Sam. xxvii. 6, "Wherefore Ziklag pertaineth unto the kings of Judah unto this day," nothing more can be inferred than that the author lived subsequent to the separation of the kingdoms (4). On the other hand, the distinction between *Israel* and *Judah* (1 Sam. xi. 8, xvii. 52, xviii. 16; 2 Sam. iii. 10, xxiv. 1) belongs to the age of David (comp. 2 Sam. ii. 9, 10, v. 1–5, xix. 41,

xx. 2). Though the death of David is not mentioned, this is to be explained by his transferring the government during his lifetime to his son Solomon; so that it was not his death which formed the conclusion of his government—the point beyond which the writer did not choose to go (5).

(1) As is assumed by *Eichhorn*, p. 529 f.; *Jahn*, p. 232 ff.; *De Wette*, Beitrr. i. p. 42 f. [an opinion which he abandoned in his Einl. § 186: a change of opinion approved by *Bleek*, pp. 357–8, who thinks that the two works take a different view of the high places for worship; that the books of Kings alone quote the written law, or in particular the Deuteronomic passages, and refer to other historical authorities, and exhibit tendencies to the Aramaic]; and *Herbst*, Einl. ii. 1, p. 139 ff. If this assumption were well founded, our books could not have been written till towards the end of the Babylonian exile, to which time the history is brought down in 2 Kings xxv. But the reasons are quite untenable: (*a*) that one plan and its execution pervade both the works; and (*b*) that there is no difference in language and style. The only thing they have in common is the theocratic point of view, but the execution is entirely different in the two: for the author of the books of Samuel usually gives the historical materials so copiously, that people have many a time supposed they had found here complete biographies of Samuel, Saul, and David; whereas the author of the books of Kings furnishes us throughout with mere short extracts bearing on the reigns of the kings, and on this account at the end of every administration he refers to the annals of the kings for further information. Then again, in the books of Kings, the chronology is given very precisely, whereas little notice is taken of it in Samuel: in Kings the authorities used are carefully mentioned, but in Samuel not at all. Finally, the books of Samuel are quite free from references to the exile, both in the subject-matter and in the language; but the books of Kings present a number of such references. Comp. *Häv.* pp. 142–3; *Welte* on *Herbst's* Einl. p. 142 ff.

(2) The length of time cannot be determined with precision; because Samuel's age is not given, and the length of Saul's reign cannot be made out from 1 Sam. xiii. 1. Comp. my chronol. Untersuchungen in the Dorpat. theol. Beitrr. ii. pp. 326 and 350 ff.

(3) In the remaining passages (1 Sam. viii. 8, xii. 2, xxix. 3, 6, 8; 2 Sam. vii. 6, and xix. 25) this formula refers to things which have continued from the past on to the time at which the author was writing.

(4) It is very questionable whether we can interpret "the kings

of Judah," 1 Sam. xxvii. 6, of "kings sprung from the tribe of Judah, and ruling over this tribe" (*Häv.* p. 144); but this also implies the division of the kingdom. Comp. *Welte, ibid.* p. 151. [We know too little to speak with certainty on the matter. Even though David and Solomon were kings of the twelve tribes, it is possible that the tribe of Judah kept somewhat apart, as it had done at first.]

(5) That David's death is not mentioned, is no proof either of the writer living not long after that event (*Hav.* p. 145), or of our books (or the sources from which they are drawn) having originally embraced 1 Kings i. and ii. (*De Wette*, § 180; *Stähelin*, p. 135; *Ewald*, Geschichte, p. 220.) [*Bleek*, p. 359 f., takes the same view as these writers.]

For the rest, 1 Sam. xxvii. 6 does not compel us to bring the date of composition down below the times of Rehoboam or Abijam (6); as the absence of any allusion to the later decay of the kingdom, or in any way to the exile, and also the purity of the language, which is free from later forms and Chaldaisms, lead us to fix upon an earlier age (7).—All the other marks which have been adduced for the purpose of fixing the date of composition more precisely, are utterly unconvincing (8).

(6) The additions in the Septuagint at 2 Sam. viii. 7, xiv. 27, from which *Thenius*, p. xxi., infers the composition to have taken place under Rehoboam, are arbitrary glosses of this translation, and cannot be employed in proof of this position.

(7) Although the books of Samuel are distinguished from the older books by many representations, conceptions, and expressions, which first come into use under Samuel and David (§ 52), yet their diction and language are still classic, and free from later Chaldaisms. There is no augmentative force in what have been reckoned Chaldaisms (by *Bertholdt*, p. 924, and especially by *Stähelin*, p. 134), like תִּשְׁתַּכְּרִין, 1 Sam. i. 14, and תִּמְצָאוּן, ix. 13 (comp. *Ewald*, ausf. Lehrbuch d. hebr. Sprache, § 191, *a*); יִשְׁרְנָה, 1 Sam. vi. 12, comp. Gen. xxx. 38 (*Ewald*, § 191, *b*): the uncontracted forms, יְהוֹשִׁיעַ, 1 Sam. xvii. 47; יְנָתֵן, 2 Sam. xxi. 6 (differently, *Ewald*, § 192, *e*); the shortened form תִּתְבֹּר, 2 Sam. xxii. 27 (*Ewald*, § 132, *d*); שְׁלָה for שְׁאֵלָה, 1 Sam. i. 17; וַיֵּרֶב for וַיֵּאָרֶב, 1 Sam. xv. 5; וַתְּזָרֵנִי for וַתְּאַזְּרֵנִי, 2 Sam. xxii. 40 (*Ewald*, § 54, *a*, and 232, *a*); וַתִּפֶּהוּ, 1 Sam. xxviii. 24; תִּמְרוּ, 2 Sam. xix. 14; תִּחַן, 2 Sam. xx. 9 (*Ewald*, § 139, *b*); יְעַשְּׂרֻנִי, 1 Sam. xvii. 25, comp. Ps. lxv. 10; וַיִּדְבַּקוּ, 1 Sam. xiv. 22, xxxi. 2 (*Ewald*, § 232, *e*); הִתְנַבְּיָת and הִתְנַבּוֹת,

1 Sam. x. 6 and 13 (*Ewald*, § 116, *b*, and § 142, *c*); the formation without a parallel, וייחר, where probably וַיִּיחַר stands for וַיֶּאֱחַר, 2 Sam. xx. 5; the לְ to designate the accusative before the verb, 1 Sam. xxii. 7 (comp. *Ewald*, § 292, *e*, [and *Drechsler* on Isa. xi. 9]); the construction of הֵרֵג with לְ, 2 Sam. iii. 30, like Job v. 2; and finally, the occasional use of the perfect instead of the imperfect with וְ of consecution, and of the imperfect instead of the perfect with וְ of consecution (comp. *Ewald*, § 342, *b*, and 343, *b*). All these linguistic phenomena are found in individual passages in even the oldest works, and do by no means betray a late age.

(8) Such are the uncritical assertions of *De Wette*, § 180, that the prophecy in 1 Sam. ii. 35 was probably not written till after the time of Solomon (1 Kings ii. 26 f.), and that 1 Sam. viii. 11–18 presupposes the experience acquired under his despotic reign (1 Kings xii.); and further, the conclusions drawn partly from the pretended mistakes in reference to Jerusalem, 1 Sam. xvii. 54, and the unsuitable interpolation by an anachronism of the passage 1 Sam. ii. 1–10, and partly from the views promulgated in these books in reference to religion and worship (*Thenius*, p. xx. f.).—Just as little can it be inferred, with *Stähelin*, p. 137 ff., from allusions of Jeremiah to our books, from the delight of the author at the dignity of the kingdom, and from the prophecy of the everlasting continuance of the house and kingdom of David (2 Sam. vii.), that they were composed in the age of Hezekiah.

We can determine nothing more than this about the person of the author, that he was a prophet, who lived not long after the time of Solomon (9).

(9) The talmudical account that Samuel wrote the books which are named after him (Baba bathr. f. 14, *b*), is refuted as unhistorical by even this one fact, that the history extends beyond the death of Samuel. See the opinions of the older writers in *Carpzov*, p. 213 sqq.

§ 54. *Sources.*

Except "the book of Jashar," quoted in 2 Sam. i. 18, in which David's elegy on Saul and Jonathan was written down (1), there are no authorities or sources adduced in the whole work, although undoubtedly the author used written documents throughout, and indeed for the most part prophetic memoirs of the life and work not only of

the prophet Samuel, but also of the kings Saul and David. We infer this with undoubted certainty, from the comparison of the two accounts of the reign of David, 2 Sam. viii.–xxiv., and 1 Chron. xi.–xxi. These present many deviations, arising from the differences in the objects of the two compositions; but for the most part they so agree, word for word, that both must have been drawn from a common source, like those "words"—that is, prophetic writings—of *Samuel*, *Nathan*, and *Gad*, which are quoted in 1 Chron. xxix. 29 (2). From this source have been derived not only the prophetic elements, but also the copious biographical and political accounts in our books; so that, at the utmost, the lists of David's heroes and officers of state, 2 Sam. viii. 15–18, xxiii. 8–39, are taken from the archives of state, or public memoirs of the recorder (2 Sam. viii. 17). Nevertheless, we must not think that use was made of annals of the kingdom, in the strict sense of the term, because their existence cannot be proved until the reign of Solomon (comp. 1 Kings xi. 41) (3). So much as this may be discovered with historical certainty, in relation to the sources of our books. All conjectures going beyond this, especially the manifold hypotheses of the more modern criticism, belong to the domain of baseless fictions (4).

(1) Whether the rest of the poetical pieces—Hannah's song of thanksgiving, 1 Sam. ii. 1–10; David's elegy on Abner, 2 Sam. iii. 33, 34; his song of thanksgiving, 2 Sam. xxii.; and his last prophetic utterance, xxiii. 1–7—were also to be found in that book, must remain undecided (*Häv.* p. 120 f.); yet it is not very probable, else one does not see why it should have been named only when that one song is quoted.

(2) The assumption of *Michaelis*, *Eichhorn*, *De Wette*, *Gramberg*, *Movers* (die bibl. Chron.), is refuted in my apolog. Versuch üb. die Chron. p. 249 ff., and by *Häv.* p. 122 f.; see the particulars below [§ 141], when the sources of Chronicles are discussed. If the words of Samuel—that is, his prophetic utterances—contained such copious information as to David's public life, that the chronicler could quote them as an authority on the subject, it is obvious that the same document must have been the principal authority upon the subject of the life and work of Samuel and Saul. Comp. *Thenius*, p. xxii. f.

(3) The assumption of most critics, that annals of the kingdom were a second source of information, along with the prophetic memoirs, rests upon a mistake, arbitrarily confounding the recorder's

memoirs for archives of state, with public annals of the kingdom. Comp. § 59.

(4) [*Bleek*, pp. 366–7, agrees very much with this statement, only he thinks that the documents of which the writer made use were sometimes inconsistent; and he refers for proof to some of the cases of alleged contradiction which have been already examined in § 52.] Such are the artificially spun-out hypotheses of *Eichhorn*, assuming the existence of "an old, short life of David, with later interpolations," for 2d Samuel; and for 1st Samuel, "an old chronicle about Samuel and Saul" (Einl. § 469, § 471, and § 475): of *Bertholdt*, assuming four old documents—for ch. i.–vii. a history of Samuel; for ch. viii.–xvi. a history of Saul, from his being chosen till his rejection; for ch. xvii.–xxx. an interpolated history of David's heroic deeds and military expeditions before his accession to the throne; and for 1 Sam. xxxi., and for all 2d Samuel, an interpolated and re-written edition of *Eichhorn's* supposed summary history of David's reign (Einl. p. 894 ff.): by *Gramberg*, who lays it down that in the history of Saul and David there are two contradictory accounts elaborated by compilers (Gesch. der Religionsid. ii. p. 80 ff.): by *Stähelin*, who believes that he has discovered in 1st Samuel the work of the Jehovist, blended with important additions by the writer who gave the work its present shape; but in 2d Samuel the work of the Jehovist alone (pp. 112 ff., 129 ff.): by *Thenius* (p. xviii. ff.), who distinguishes (*a*) a history of Samuel (i.–vii.); (*b*) a history of Saul according to tradition, probably inserted from a popular document (viii., x. 17–21, xi., xii., xv., xvi., xviii. 6–14, xxvi., xxviii. 3–25, xxxi.); (*c*) a condensed history of Saul according to old written accounts (ix., x. 1–16, xiii., xiv.); (*d*) continuation and extension of this into a history of David (xiv. 52, xvii., xviii. partly, xix., xx., xxi. 1–10, xxii., xxiii. 1–14, xxiv., xxv., xxvii., xxviii. 1, xxix., xxx., 2 Sam. i.–iv., v. partly, vii.–viii. 18); (*e*) a special history of David, rising almost into a biography (xi. 2–27, xii. 1–25, xiii.–xx.); (*f*) an appendix (xxi.–xxiv.): and by *Ewald* (Gesch. i. p. 180 ff.), who takes for granted two sorts of "earliest small beginnings and attempts at histories of the kings," proceeding either from a purely popular contemplation of the past, or from the prophetic conception of the events; also later re-touchings and interpolations.

§ 55. *Historical Character.*

The historical narrative in the books of Samuel is distinguished by vivid and lively representation, by characteristic delineation of the persons who come upon the scene as actors, and by simplicity and

precision in the description of events in respect of their locality and all the subsidiary circumstances. According to every principle of justice, this necessarily vindicates their character for historic truth and fidelity, not only in general, but also in particular and for individual cases: since the whole of the alleged contradictions are unfounded (§ 52); and the miracles (2 Sam. xxiv. 15–17) and the predictions (1 Sam. ii. 35; 2 Sam. vii., xii. 11) form critical moments which are essential in the course of the development of the theocracy (1).

(1) *Thenius* remarks, p. xxiii., with reference only to the [alleged] older parts of the work: "They are among the most beautiful which the historical books of the Old Testament present to us; we obtain by means of them a distinct view of the actors in history; they are recommended by the charming simplicity of their representations, and they give us a high conception of the many-sided influence of the prophetic agency." We may without scruple extend this verdict to the entire work; because the assumption of more recent elements, composed in accordance with more or less altered oral traditions, rests exclusively upon subjective dogmatic prejudices.

THE BOOKS OF KINGS (מְלָכִים).

Commentaries:—*Seb. Leonhardi*, ὑπομνήματα in libb. Regum, Erfurt. 1606, Lipsiæ 1610, 1616. *Franc. de Mendoza*, comm. in libb. Regum, Coloniæ 1634, fol. *Serarius, Bonfrerius, Casp. Sanctius, Bugenhagen, Brentius, V. Strigel, Seb. Schmidt, Clericus, Maurer*; see § 224 sq. *K. Fr. Keil*, Comm. über die BB. der Könige, Leipzig (Moskau) 1845; [again in *Keil and Delitzsch's* Comm., Leipzig 1865]. *O. Thenius*, die BB. der Könige erklärt, Leipzig 1849 (Part ix. of the kurzgef. exeget. Handbuch).

§ 56. *Name, Division, Contents, and Object.*

This work, originally forming an undivided whole (1), takes its name from its contents; since it narrates the history of the theocracy under the kings from Solomon until the kingly office was abolished, and the kingdom of Judah perished in the Babylonish exile. Thus we have a principle of division into the three periods into which the history of this time falls, answering to the three great phases in the

shapes assumed by the kingly office: I. The government of Solomon. II. The history of the separated kingdoms. III. The history of the kingdom of Judah after the dissolution of that of the ten tribes (2).

(1) The division into *two* books of Kings, like the two books of Samuel, proceeded from the Septuagint and the Vulgate, and was first transferred to the Hebrew editions of the Bible by *Dan. Bomberg.* *Origen*, in *Euseb.* hist. eccl. vi. 25: *Βασιλειῶν τρίτη, τετάρτη, ἐν ἑνὶ Ὀναμμέλεχ Δαβίδ, ὅπερ ἐστι βασιλεία Δαβίδ.* *Jerome* in prolog. galeat.: "quartus *Melachim*, *i.e.* Regum, qui iii. et iv. Regum volumine continetur."

(2) The *first period* embraces the reign of Solomon. (*a*) He mounts the throne, and strengthens his authority (1 Kings i. ii.). (*b*) The glory of his reign: (*α*) his marriage, his prayer and sacrifice at Gibeon, and his wisdom as a judge (iii.); (*β*) the officers of his court and the officers of state, his power and pomp and wisdom (iv.–v. 14); (*γ*) his buildings, preparations for them by the league with Hiram (v. 15–32), building of the temple and the palace (vi. vii.), consecration of the temple (viii.–ix. 9), other buildings, navigation (ix. 10–28); (*δ*) his great renown, and his revenues (x.). (*c*) His sinning by polygamy and idolatry, the consequences of this, and his death (xi.).—The *second period* contains the history, given contemporaneously, of the separated kingdoms of Israel and Judah, in three stages. (*a*) Origin of the separation, and hostile attitude of the kingdoms till the accession of Ahab to the throne (xii.–xvi. 28). (*b*) The rule of the house of Ahab in Israel, worship of Baal, resistance to this by Elijah and Elisha, alliance and intermarriage of the two royal houses, inauspicious struggles with the Syrians, extermination by Jehu of the two kings Joram of Israel and Ahaziah of Judah [and their kindred] (1 Kings xvi. 29–2 Kings x.). (*c*) History of the two kingdoms, again becoming hostile, from the time of Jehu's accession in Israel and Athaliah's usurpation in Judah, till the ruin of the kingdom of Israel in the sixth year of Hezekiah (xi.–xvii.).—The *third period* gives the history of the kingdom of Judah, from Hezekiah till its ruin and the Babylonian exile (xviii.–xxv.).—The assertion of *Eichhorn* (Einl. iii. pp. 542–3) is unfounded, that the history of the kingdom of Judah is conjoined with the other only on account of the synchronism. Against this, comp. my Comment. p. xii. f.

Yet these books do not give a mere chronicle of the kings and their doings. On the contrary, their object is to lay before us and to

show the course of development of the theocracy according to the principle traced beforehand in the promise imparted to David by Jehovah, 2 Sam. vii. 12–15. Thus, in fulfilment of that promise of the continuance of David's kingly office, God not merely turned the kingdom to Solomon, but also preserved a part of it, along with the chosen city Jerusalem, for his descendants, even at the time of the revolt of the ten tribes in consequence of his own sin. And thus also, while He ordained that revolt as a punishment on Israel and Judah for their sins; and while, on the one hand, He sought to bring back the revolted tribes to the law and to the testimony, both by mighty words and deeds of the prophets, and by severe judgments, until their hardening made it necessary to cast them from His sight, and to banish them from His land; and while, on the other hand, He chastised the backsliders in the kingdom of Judah by prophetic admonitions and by hostile invasions: still, amid all these punitive judgments, He preserved the seed of David upon the throne. Nor did He let the lamp of His servant David be extinguished, even when the kingdom perished, and the people were carried away to Babylon; but after an imprisonment for thirty-seven years, He raised the exiled king Jehoiachin anew to royal honours, as a predictive testimony that He would preserve inviolably to His people "the sure mercies of David," and would fulfil them (3).

(3) This principle stands out distinctly from the beginning to the end of the work: already in the elevation of Solomon to the throne, agreeably to the divine promise (ch. i.); subsequently in the passages ii. 4, 24, 45, iii. 6, vi. 12, viii. 25 f., ix. 5, xi. 12, 13, 34, 36, 39, xv. 4, 2 Kings viii. 19, xix. 34, xx. 6; finally, the concluding notice of Jehoiachin being delivered from imprisonment, and elevated again to royal honour, xxv. 27–30. Comp. *my* Commentary, p. x. ff., and *Thenius*, Comm. p. xi.—This tendency is mistaken by *Fr. Kern*, "upon the main point of view in the books of Kings," in *Bengel's* neu. Archiv. ii. 2, p. 469 ff.; *Häv.* ii. 1, p. 146; and *De Wette*, § 183, who ascribe "a prophetico-didactic tendency" to the work, and look upon the series of kings merely as an external thread on which the principal contents are strung together, and which in this way constitutes rather the formal than the material unity of the whole (*Häv.* p. 150). The undeniable fact that there are copious details of the prophetic agency in both kingdoms, is to be explained not so much by a peculiar tendency on the part of the author, as much rather by

the attitude which the prophetic office assumed alongside of the kingly office, or in opposition to it in the theocracy. For the prophet's office as a watchman was the divine controlling power employed by the Spirit of Jehovah Himself to act upon the kingly office, which stood in the room of Jehovah, to exercise the judicial and executive power in that divine state which rested on the foundation of the revealed law. Comp. *Oehler* in *Tholuck*, litt. Anzeiger, 1846, No. 32, p. 254; and my Comm. p. ix. ff.—Also the intention "to strengthen his contemporaries living in exile along with him, to cling faithfully to the covenant made by God through the instrumentality of Moses, and unwaveringly to honour the only true God" (*Thenius*, p. x.), is not to be deduced from some special tendency peculiar to these books; but it is founded on the very nature of the theocracy, and of a historical representation, in which its spirit is rightly apprehended.

§ 57. *Unity and Independence of the Book.*

Although the books of Kings are for the most part extracts from more copious annals, yet they are not a compilation from various writings which are partly contradictory: they are the laboured production of *one* author, upon a peculiar plan, whose internal unity is clear, as much from the symmetry of the representation as from the unity of the language. [*Bleek's* view is the same, p. 372.] The author quotes his authorities (§ 59), from the beginning to the end, for the most part according to standing formulas: in the case of any important event, he carefully marks the chronology (1); he judges the proceedings and acts of the kings continually according to the standard of the law of Moses (2); and he describes the commencement, the character, and the conclusion of every reign, as also the death and burial of the kings, in almost the same phrases throughout (3).

(1) Comp. 1 Kings ii. 11, vi. 1, 37, 38, vii. 1, viii. 2, 65, 66, ix. 10, xi. 42, xiv. 20, 21, 25, xv. 1, 2, 9, 10, 25, 33, xvi. 8, 10, 15, 16, 23, 29, xviii. 1, xxii. 1, 2, 41, 42, 52; 2 Kings i. 17, iii. 1, viii. 16, 25, 26, ix. 29, x. 36, xi. 3, 4, xii. 1, 2, 7, xiii. 1, 10, xiv. 1, 2, 17, 23, xv. 1, 2, 8, 13, 17, 23, 27, 30, 32, 33, xvi. 1, 2, xvii. 1, 5, 6, xviii. 1, 2, 9, 10, 13, xxi. 1, 19, xxii. 1, 3, xxiii. 23, 31, 36, xxiv. 1, 8, 12, 18, xxv. 1–3, 8, 25, 27.—As to the difficulties in individual chronological accounts, comp. my Comm. on the passages in question, and particularly p. 182 ff.

(2) References to the law are found at 1 Kings ii. 3, iii. 14, vi. 12, 13, viii. 58, 61, ix. 4, 6, xi. 33, 38; 2 Kings x. 31, xi. 12, xiv. 6, xvii. 13, 15, 34, 37, xviii. 6, xxi. 8, xxii. 8 ff., xxiii. 3, 21, 24, 25.

(3) Comp. 1 Kings xi. 43, xiv. 20, 31, xv. 8, 24, xxii. 51; 2 Kings viii. 24, xiii. 9, xiv. 29, xv. 7, 38, xvi. 20, xx. 21, xxi. 18, xxiv. 6. The character given of individual kings of Judah, 1 Kings xv. 3, 11, xxii. 43, 2 Kings xii. 3, xiv. 3, xv. 3, 34, xviii. 3, xxii. 2, and xvi. 2, xxi. 2, 20, xxiii. 37, xxiv. 9, 19; of Israel, 1 Kings xiv. 8 [? 9], xv. 26, 31, xvi. 19, 26, 30, 31, xxii. 53, 2 Kings iii. 3, x. 29, 31, xiii. 2, 11, xiv. 24, xv. 9, 18, 24, 28, xvii. 21, 22. See, besides, the expressions about the choice of the city of Jerusalem and of the temple, 1 Kings viii. 16, 29, ix. 3, xi. 36, xv. 4, 2 Kings xxi. 4, 7, xxiii. 27; of devotion to Jehovah, 1 Kings viii. 61, xi. 4, xv. 3, 14, 2 Kings xx. 3.

The language also continues the same in all parts of the work, even to the extent of individual varieties introduced by means of the authorities employed; it presents no traces of a later *usus loquendi* (4). Nowhere can there be really shown direct or indirect contradictions (5), various and discordant reports, historical and legendary narratives (6), or repetitions and unsuitable interpolations, such as would point to a diversity of authorship (7).

(4) Comp. עָצוּר וְעָזוּב, 1 Kings xiv. 10, xxi. 21, 2 Kings ix. 8, xiv. 26; the frequent use of the particle אָז, 1 Kings iii. 16, viii. 1, 12, ix. 11, 24, xi. 7, xvi. 21, xxii. 50, 2 Kings xii. 18, xiv. 8, xvi. 5; "he sold himself to work iniquity," 1 Kings xxi. 20, 25, 2 Kings xvii. 17. Also later forms, words, and expressions, like נִיר, 1 Kings xi. 36, xv. 4, 2 Kings viii. 19, instead of נֵר, 2 Sam. xxi. 17; צִידֹנִין, 1 Kings xi. 33; רָצִין, 2 Kings xi. 13; אַתִּי for אֵתִי, 1 Kings xiv. 2, 2 Kings iv. 16, 23, viii. 1; אוֹתוֹ for אֹתוֹ, 2 Kings i. 15, iii. 11, 12, viii. 8, and אוֹתָם for אֹתָם, 2 Kings vi. 16; בְּהַשְׁדָּה, 2 Kings vii. 12; סְבִיב, 2 Kings viii. 21; בְּהִשְׁתַּחֲוָיָתִי, 2 Kings v. 18; מְשֻׁלָּנוּ, 2 Kings vi. 11; שָׂרֵי הַחֲיָלִים, 1 Kings xv. 20, 2 Kings xxv. 23, 26; כּוֹר for חֹמֶר, 1 Kings v. 2, 25; בֶּרֶק, 2 Kings xii. 6 ff., xxii. 5; דַּיִק, 2 Kings xxv. 1; מְרִינוֹת, 1 Kings xx. 14; רַב־טַבָּחִים, 2 Kings xxv. 8; פֶּחָה, 1 Kings x. 15, xx. 24, 2 Kings xviii. 24; קָבָל, 2 Kings xv. 10, and others.—The collection of later words presented in *Stähelin*, krit. Unterss. p. 150 ff., greatly needs sifting, as the larger number of them are found in use so early as in the language of the age of David and Solomon.

(5) *Thenius* finds *direct* contradictions only in two places; in both, however, without any legitimate reason:—*a.* "According to 1 Kings

ix. 22, Solomon made no bondmen of the children of Israel; whereas according to xi. 28 he did." But in ix. 21 [? in v. 27, or in the English version, v. 13] it is expressly said that Solomon raised a levy, מַס [margin, "a tribute" of men], 30,000 out of all Israel, and sent them to fell timber in Lebanon. All that is said in ix. 22 is, that no Israelites were reduced to *bond* service—עֲבַד; in xi. 28, again, nothing is said of this, but of סֵבֶל ["charge" or "burden"]. There is thus no contradiction in Kings; but one does exist in *Thenius'* Commentary. On v. 27 (p. 51), the remark is made upon the מַס raised by Solomon, that we must think not of *bond* service, but of *free* Israelites performing the lighter work of felling timber; on xi. 28, again (p. 174), "סבל ganz wie מס, nicht die Last, sondern coll. die Last-oder Frohnschaft."—(*b*) "The identical predictions recorded in 2 Kings ix. 26, and in 1 Kings xxi. 19, give quite different places for the punishment." This is incorrect. For in 2 Kings ix. 26 Jehu adduces Elijah's prediction of the extermination of Ahab (1 Kings xxi. 24) only in its general sense, not with verbal precision; since, in consequence of Ahab's self-humiliation (vers. 27–29), the long-suffering of God carried out this threatening to the letter, only partially upon Ahab himself, its full weight falling upon his son Joram (2 Kings ix.): this *Thenius* himself acknowledges at 1 Kings xxi. 29.—Still feebler are the *indirect* contradictions. For (*a*) when circumstances that no longer existed after the fall of the kingdom (in which time the author wrote) are indicated by the formula "unto this day," as if they were still subsisting (1 Kings viii. 8, ix. 21, xii. 19; 2 Kings viii. 22), it merely proves that our author took this formula from his authorities' works, composed before the kingdom fell, without thinking it needful to blot out words of which he had no fear that they could be misunderstood. (*b*) "Things are reported which do not harmonize with earlier statements." This again is incorrect. For (*a*) in 1 Kings xii. 25 it is not said that Shechem and Penuel were Jeroboam's sole residences, but only that he "built Shechem, and dwelt therein, and went out from thence, and built Penuel," without even saying that he resided there. Consequently, if he dwelt at Tirzah, according to xiv. 17, this account contradicts neither xii. 25 nor xv. 21, 33: for in xii. 25 it is not said that Jeroboam changed his residence only once; nor in xv. 21, 33, that Baasha was the first to choose the city of Tirzah for his residence. Still less can "the house" in xiv. 17 and 12 be understood of a castle erected in connection with the city of Shechem, to overawe it; for ver. 12 makes it as plain as possible that the royal palace was situated within the city, since Jeroboam's wife had to go *into* the city (namely Tirzah, ver. 17) to reach the king's house.—(*β*) 1 Kings

xx. 13, 22, 28, 35 ff., xxii. 8, in which "a multitude of prophets appear," involve the notion of "the prophets dwelling undisturbed in Samaria; whereas, according to xviii. 22, xix. 10, 14, they had been all cut off except Elijah." An utter perversion. In xx. 13–28 and xxii. 8, Ahab meets with only *one* prophet, and in xx. 35 with one of the sons of the prophets; from which it does not follow that there was any *multitude* of prophets of Jehovah, far less that they could dwell in Samaria undisturbed, without taking at all into consideration that the prophet Micaiah had been imprisoned (as *Ewald*, Gesch. iii. p. 500, rightly infers from xxii. 26, "Carry him back," etc., which *Thenius* toils in vain to explain away by an arbitrary "interpolation"). It follows just as little from Elijah's solitary struggle with the 400 prophets of Baal on Mount Carmel, and from his supposition as he fled to Horeb that he alone survived, that actually *all* the prophets of Jehovah except himself had been exterminated; and also, as *Thenius*, xviii. 22, asserts, that the 100 prophets hidden by Obadiah had been discovered and put to death.—(γ) "According to xx. 42, Ahab was to be punished on account of an act that in itself was noble-minded" (though it should rather be called an impolitic and untheocratic act, proceeding from weakness, want of character, and self-blinded vanity; see my Comm. p. 289 f.), "though, in the case before us, no hint had been given in any way (?) that it was unallowable." This statement is not correct; yet if it were, the story is not in contradiction to the preceding narrative. For in ver. 28 [and ver. 22] the prophet had not advised him to spare Benhadad: he had only promised him victory, that God would give into his hand the whole host of the Syrians, and had bidden him strengthen himself, and mark, and see what he should do; and in ver. 35 ff., the son of the prophets neither did nor said anything unsuitable to what precedes.—(δ) "According to 2 Kings ix. 26, Naboth's children also were killed by Ahab; whereas according to 1 Kings xxi. 13 it is Naboth himself alone who is killed." In this passage the killing of the children is indeed not mentioned, because it was a matter of course, else Ahab could not have seized Naboth's inheritance from his fathers (*Michaelis*, Mos. Recht, v. § 229; *Ewald*, iii. p. 449).—Lastly, (ε) "that the course of the narrative does not satisfy expectations which the reader was justified in forming." The fault in this case is not in the author, whose business is to relate events, and not to construct them: it must then be either in the reader, or, as actually it is here, in the expositor, who gives such a meaning to the divine commission to Elijah, 1 Kings xix. 15–17, that it does not correspond with the historical realization.

(6) The assertion that there are duplicate reports, in different

shapes, of the same transaction is left without proof by *Thenius*, except by a reference to the accounts of Solomon's navigation, 1 Kings ix. 27, 28, and x. 22. These do not in the least prove it; because the supposition that the two passages refer to the same navigation to Ophir has not yet been established with certainty, in spite of all that has been said for it by writers from *Bredow* to *Thenius*. Nor on the supposition of this identity would the passages be contradictory; but the second would give the report of this mercantile expedition more precisely and copiously than the first.—*Legendary* is the epithet applied to the narratives of the wonderful works of Elijah and Elisha, according to the old Rationalist prejudice against the possibility of miracles. The contents and the form of these narratives are naturally distinguished from the reports of the deeds and undertakings of the kings; but only for this reason, that quite another spirit and another power ruled in the life and working of the prophets, who were animated and incited by the Spirit of the Lord, than that which ruled in the life and conduct of godless and idolatrous kings. And "the formal accumulation of the miraculous" in the life of Elijah and Elisha only proves that these men of God needed to meet the advancing spirit of apostasy with unwonted powers, if they were to fulfil their divine mission; comp. *my* Commentary, p. 248 ff.—Also the isolated peculiarities of expression by which these sections are distinguished from the other parts of the work (comp. the collection presented in *Thenius*, p. vii.) are not, in even the remotest degree, a proof of their legendary character; on the contrary, we have here a mark of the greatest historical fidelity, since a person in a later age, noting down uncertain and fluctuating legends, would have had neither the opportunity for altering the expression, nor the capacity in this place, "as nowhere else, to exhibit a pregnant brevity of expression, and to introduce delicate allusions into his discourse." The assertion that the history of Elijah has evidently proceeded from an author not the same as the historian of Elisha, is unfounded, resting only on pretended and not on real differences (see Note 5). But if it were so, this would furnish no valid argument against the unity and historical character of these narratives: it would only prove that the accounts of these two greatest prophets of the kingdom of Israel were noted down during their lifetime by themselves or their contemporaries, and not first, after they had left this world, by a *single* writer who followed oral tradition.

(7) The repetitions, 2 Kings ix. 14, 16 compared with viii. 28, 29, and xiv. 15, 16 compared with xiii. 12, 13, are evidence neither of "momentary forgetfulness in the compiler," nor of a variety of authorship in the several sections: they are merely for the sake of perspi-

cuity, according to the standing practice of the Shemitic historians (*Ewald*, Kompos. d. Gen. p. 166 ff.). The inference of *Thenius* (on xiv. 15), from the diversity in writing the name of Joash king of Israel—three times יְהוֹאָשׁ in xiii. 12, 13; on the contrary, in xiv. 8–17 uniformly יוֹאָשׁ—is worthless as a proof, since in the same section there is a change of writing: for instance, יואש in xiii. 9, 12, 13, 14, and xiv. 1; and, on the contrary, יהואש in xiii. 10, 25, xiv. 8, 9, 11, 13, 15, 16. And thus both forms appear in the portion xiii. 10–13, which not only belongs throughout to the same piece of writing, but has been taken out of *one* peculiar exemplar, according to *Thenius*. How little justification there is for assuming a difference of sources of information on account of the difference in writing this name, is clear also from the name of the king of Judah, which is written יהואש in xii. 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 19, xiv. 13; and, on the contrary, יואש in xi. 2, xii. 20, 21, xiii. 1, xiv. 1,—from which the utmost that we could infer might be, that the author of our books, when giving information word for word from the annals of the kingdoms, retained the older and original form which these annals used, but employed the shorter form in abridged or transitional notices which proceeded from himself.—Finally, there is nothing whatever to prove the assertion that interconnected passages have been separated, and that individual sections have been interpolated at unsuitable places. For 1 Kings ix. 24, 25 stands certainly in a relation to iii. 1–3, but cannot have immediately followed iii. 3 in any copy (comp. my commentary on ix. 24); and xi. 41 is not the continuation of x. 29; nor is xxii. 1 the immediate continuation of xx. 29, from which it is separated by an interval of three years, in which the events of ch. xxi. occurred. Also the account of the word of Jehovah, which came to Solomon while the temple was being built, stands in a perfectly suitable place at 1 Kings vi. 11–13; and the narrative of the death of Elisha, 2 Kings xiii. 14 ff., is appended to the history of Joash, in conformity with the facts of the case, although Elisha died during the lifetime of that king.

The books of Kings certainly contain references to the books of Samuel, and are attached to the thread of the history where it is broken off in them (8). At no time have they formed one work with them in whole or in part; but from the beginning they have constituted an independent work, distinguished from the earlier historical books not only linguistically, but also by their arrrangement, their aim, and their treatment of the history (9).

(8) 1 Kings ii. 26, 27 refers back to 1 Sam. ii. 30–33; 1 Kings

ii. 4, 5, to 1 Sam. v. 17–19 [apparently an error in writing for 2 Sam. iii. 27–29, and xx. 10]; viii. 18, 25, to 2 Sam. vii. 12–16. Comp. besides 1 Kings ii. 11 with 2 Sam. v. 5, and 1 Kings iv. 1–6 with 2 Sam. viii. 15–18.—The books of Samuel carry forward the history of David to the end of his administration; the books of Kings begin with the transmission of the administration to Solomon and the death of David, ch. i. 2. The linguistic affinity between these chapters and 2d Samuel (*Stähelin, ibid.* p. 135) is no proof that they were originally united, but is to be explained by their both having proceeded from a common source; comp. *my* Commentary, p. xv.

(9) Comp. above, § 40, Note 5, and § 53, Note 1.

§ 58. *Date and Author.*

The narrative in our work comes down to the times of Evil-merodach, but nothing is ever hinted of the end of the exile. The composition must therefore have taken place in the second half of the Babylonian captivity, and no doubt after the death of Jehoiachin (2 Kings xxv. 29); but we cannot determine whether during the reign of Evil-merodach or after it (1).

The writer, who lived in Babylonia, and not in Egypt, is not the prophet Jeremiah, and not probably a pupil of this prophet (2); but a citizen of Judah living in the Babylonian exile, of whose personal relations we can say no more than this, that he was animated by the prophetic spirit, and was very familiar with the prophetic literature of his people (3).

(1) It does not necessarily follow, from the account of Jehoiachin being again raised to honour by Evil-merodach, and being nourished from the king's table as long as he lived, that Jehoiachin died before Evil-merodach, because no mention is made of any following Babylonian king. *Häv.* p. 170. On the contrary, comp. my Commentary, p. xvi. f., and *Ewald*, Gesch. i. p. 214, [and *Bleek*, p. 368, who inclines to think that Evil-merodach was dead].

(2) The reasons assigned for declaring Jeremiah to be the author, as the Talmudists and the older theologians do (comp. *Carpzov*, Introd. i. p. 242 sqq.), are as follows: The linguistic affinity between our work and the writings of this prophet; the dark view of the history which is common to both; certain favourite ideas in both, especially the idea of the choice and continuance of the royal house of David, and that of the choice of Jerusalem; the similar predilection in the

two writers for borrowing phrases from the Pentateuch, and the references carefully made to earlier prophecies; and finally, the agreement of 2 Kings xxiv. 18 ff. with Jer. lii. (*Häv.* p. 171 ff.; *Graf*, i. c. p. 61 sqq.). But in so far as affinity in language and in ideas really exists, it is to be explained partly by their belonging to much the same period, partly by our author's acquaintance with the writings of Jeremiah (comp. *Kueper*, Jerem. librorum ss. interpr. p. 56 sqq.). And 2 Kings xxiv. 18 ff. agrees with Jer. lii., neither because the editor of Jeremiah borrowed this chapter from Kings (*Rosenmüller*; *Maurer* on Jeremiah; *Bertholdt*, Einl. p. 1475; *Herbst*, Einl. ii. 2, p. 55), nor because Jeremiah composed the books of Kings, and adopted into his work this section from his prophetical book (*Carpzov*, p. 152; *Häv.* p. 172 f.); but the explanation is, that this section has been extracted by the author or editor in the two cases from a common more copious source,—a conclusion which comes out from the linguistic variations, to say nothing of the differences in the accounts of matters of fact. Comp. הֲהָמוֹן, 2 Kings xxv. 11, with הָאֲמוֹן, Jer. lii. 15; דַּלַּת הָאָרֶץ, Kings, ver. 12, with דַּלּוֹת הָאָרֶץ, Jeremiah, ver. 16; and וַיְדַבֵּר אִתּוֹ מִשְׁפָּט, Kings, ver. 6, while the last word in Jeremiah, ver. 9, is מִשְׁפָּטִים. And comp. my Commentary, p. xviii., and pp. 607–8.

(3) The prophetic character of our author is inferred from the prophetic conception of history as laid down in his work. We take Babylon to be the place of composition, not so confidently from 1 Kings v. 4, as *Thenius* supposes (comp. my Commentary on this text), but principally from 2 Kings xxv. 27–29, in combination with the circumstance that there exists no valid reason for assuming that it was composed in Egypt (*Thenius*, p. ix.). [*Bleek*, p. 369, thinks it was probably written in Egypt; but he gives no reason, except in so far as it may be included in his opinion that Baruch was the author.]

§ 59. *Sources of Information.*

As sources of information of which the author has made use, and from which he has extracted, and to which he refers for fuller information as to the life, the acts, and particular undertakings, buildings, etc., of the individual kings, there are named, for Solomon's reign, סֵפֶר דִּבְרֵי שְׁלֹמֹה (1 Kings xi. 41); for the history of the kings of Judah, סֵפֶר דִּבְרֵי הַיָּמִים לְמַלְכֵי יְהוּדָה (1 Kings xiv. 29, xv. 7, 23, xxii. 46; 2 Kings viii. 23, xii. 20, and often); and for those of the kings of Israel, סֵ֣פֶר דִּבְרֵי֙ הַיָּמִ֔ים לְמַלְכֵ֖י יִשְׂרָאֵ֑ל (1 Kings xiv. 19, xv. 31, xvi. 5, 14, 20, 27, xxii. 39; 2 Kings i. 18, and often). Without doubt, the last-named

works are public annals of the kingdoms, yet by no means the official chronicles of the kingdoms, or official notes of the reigns and the undertakings of the kings made by the publicly appointed מְזַכִּירִים (1); but they were prophetic annals, composed partly from the chronicles of the kingdoms, partly from prophetic monograms and collections of predictions which reached to the time of Jehoiakim in the kingdom of Judah (2 Kings xxiv. 5), and to the times of Pekah in the kingdom of Israel (2 Kings xv. 31). Nor were they written successively from the rise of the two kingdoms till the end of these reigns which have just been named, by different prophets coming one after another, and carrying the work forward without interruption. But not long before the fall of the kingdom of Judah, "the book of the chronicles of the kings" of each of the two kingdoms was composed in a finished form, by bringing together the most important things which had been noted down, both about the history of the individual kings, whether by the annalists of the kingdoms, or whether by other contemporary historians; and also about the agency of the prophets, so far as this made a deep impression upon the course of public affairs, whether written by these prophets themselves, or whether by their contemporaries. These works, in their final form, lay before the author of our books of Kings (2).—"The book of the acts of Solomon" had had a similar origin; yet it had never formed a part of those annals of the two kingdoms, and no doubt it had been edited earlier (3). —Not only is there no historical testimony to the existence of any other sources of information; but in addition, there is no foundation for such an assumption, either in the contents or in the character of our work (4).

(1) This is the view entertained by *Jahn*, Einl. ii. p. 247; *Movers*, d. bibl. Chron. pp. 185 f., 191; *Häv.* p. 150 ff.; *Welte* on *Herbst's* Einl. ii. 1, p. 155, and others. Against such a representation of these "chronicles of the kings of Judah" and "of Israel," there are—(*a*) the fact that we find no historical trace of public annalists in the kingdom of Israel, and that their existence is extremely improbable, on account of the continual changes of dynasty, though there were no other reason; (*b*) the character of these annals, so far as we can learn it with certainty from the extracts in our books of Kings and Chronicles: for besides the genuinely theocratic conception of the history (which, to be sure, might possibly be due to our canonical

writer's manner of using them), not only were there many prophetic utterances directed against the unlawful proceedings of the kings, but there were prophetic writings adopted entire (2 Chron. xx. 34, xxxii. 32, and xxxiii. 18; comp. my Commentary, p. xxii. ff.). [*Bleek* agrees very much with the views expressed throughout this section, except perhaps the closing sentence; for he leans to the view of *Ewald*, that there was at least one additional historical source, a history of Elijah and Elisha. See below, Note 4; and in reference to a history of these two prophets, see § 57, Note 6.]

(2) This follows unequivocally from the formula which often returns, "unto this day," never referring to the times of the exile, but throughout to the times in which the kingdom of Judah still subsisted, mostly its later period. On this account it cannot proceed from the author of our books of Kings, but must be derived from the annals which he has used. This receives additional confirmation from the occurrence of the same thing in several passages of our books of Chronicles: comp. together, 1 Kings viii. 8 with 2 Chron. v. 9; 1 Kings ix. 13, 21, with 2 Chron. viii. 8; 1 Kings x. 12 and xii. 19 with 2 Chron. x. 19; 2 Kings viii. 22 with 2 Chron. xxi. 10; 2 Kings x. 27, xiv. 7, xvi. 6, xvii. 23, 34 (41).

(3) *Bertholdt*, p. 935, and *Thenius*, p. v., identify "the book of the acts of Solomon" with "the words of Nathan the prophet," 2 Chron. ix. 29, but quite arbitrarily. We believe that "the book of the acts of Solomon" stood in the same relation to the three prophetic writings quoted in 2 Chron. ix. 29, as did "the chronicles of the kings of Judah" and "of Israel" to the prophetic writings on special subjects quoted in our books of Chronicles; that is, it was a work elaborated partly from the official chronicles and other historical monographs on Solomon, partly from prophetic notes regarding him and his relation to the Lord. This belief is forced upon us not only by the circumstance that reference is made to this writing for further information as to Solomon's reign, in the same way as the chronicles of the kings of Judah and Israel are referred to for the history of these reigns, but also by the relation in which the extract from it given in our books of Kings stands to that given in our books of Chronicles. [*Bleek*, pp. 150–1, says this view, that it is the work of a private author after the death of Solomon, is much preferable to the view that it is a public chronicle of his kingdom, as *Keil* had supposed in his Commentary.]

(4) The assumption of *Movers*, p. 185 ff., that the writer had used still another authority which has not been cited by him, the book of the kings of Israel, adduced in 1 Chron. ix. 1, 2 Chron. xx.

34, has already been rightly rejected by *Stähelin*, p. 157, as unfounded. Nor can the hypothesis of *Thenius*, p. v., be proved, that our author did not use the annals quoted by him, but only an extract from them with which he had met. For we no more see why the composer of our books of Kings should have contented himself with referring to his authority once for all, in case he had made use of the annals themselves, than why in this case there should also have been no occurrence of repetitions such as have been spoken of in § 57, Note 7. Still less does it follow from the deviations in Chronicles and in the Septuagint, from 1 Kings xiv. 22 and 2 Kings iii. 3, that the pretended extract still lay in its original connection before the chronicler and the Greek translator; or from 1 Kings xvi. 1–4, that this section was borrowed, not from the annals, but immediately from the words of the prophet Jehu, to which reference is made in 2 Chron. xx. 34.

§ 60. *Historical Character.*

The historical fidelity of the books of Kings in reference to the political intelligence is universally acknowledged; for there the careful use of the authorities referred to is manifest, partly by their prevailing spirit of purest truth and morality, as well as genuine theocratic piety (1), partly by a comparison of the narrative in them with 2d Chronicles, which has been elaborated mostly from the same authorities. On the contrary, the intelligence about the agency of the prophets, so far as it transcends the bounds of ordinary actual life, and contains miraculous facts or supernatural predictions, is alleged by neological criticism to be legendary and mythical; yet rather in accordance with dogmatical prejudices than for critical and historical reasons. In this procedure, however, the essence of the theocracy is as entirely ignored as the Spirit of God moving the prophets, and the position of the prophetic to the kingly office as the counter-balance to it in both kingdoms; and there is a mere begging the question in reference to the later origin of pretended legends about the prophets (2).

(1) Comp. my Commentary, p. xxvii.

(2) The proofs brought forward by *Thenius* for distinguishing the legendary and traditional elements have been already perceived to be valueless, § 57, Note 6. What he lays stress upon, as additional

proofs that the history of Elijah and Elisha was the latest of being reduced to writing, are the want of exact statements as to place and time, proper names selected on account of their significance, blunders as to geographical realities, improbabilities, and traces of later customs (p. ix.). These are partly incorrect: comp. only the exact statements as to places, 1 Kings xvii. 3, 9, xviii. 19, 40, xix. 15, xxi. 18, 2 Kings i. 3, 9, ii. 1, 2, 4, 7, 18, 23, iv. 8, 25, 38, vi. 13, vii. 3, compared with vi. 24, viii. 7; and statements as to time, 1 Kings xviii. 1, compared with xvii. 7, 15, xviii. 26, 27, 29, 36; whilst there are reasons, perfectly suitable to the writer's object, for preferring the logical order to that of chronological narrative in the account of Elisha's miracles (comp. *my* Comm. p. 348). Of others of these assertions there is no proof: such as the choice of the names Obadiah and Naaman, on account of their signification, so that they are said to be unhistorical; the blunder, offending against geographical reality, discovered in 1 Kings xix. 8; and the alleged improbabilities and traces of later customs in 1 Kings xviii. 46 and 2 Kings iv. 12, 23. [*Bleek*, p. 372, says it is quite erroneous to suppose, with *Stähelin* and *De Wette*, § 185, note *a*, that Solomon's dedication prayer is a composition of the age of the exile; though vers. 33 f., 46 ff., seem to conceive of a part having gone into captivity, yet vers. 33, 48, 25 imply that the temple and the reigning house of David were still in Jerusalem, as *Ewald*, i. 211, rightly thought.]

CHAPTER II.

THE PROPHETICAL PREDICTIVE BOOKS.

(נְבִיאִים אַחֲרוֹנִים.)

H. Witsius, de prophetis et prophetia, in his Miscellan. sacr. t. i. *Nic. Gürtler*, systema theologiæ prophetic., Amstelodami 1702. *Joh. Smith*, de prophetia et prophetis, in *Joh. Cleric.* Veter. Test. prophetæ, etc., Amstelodami 1731, pp. i.–xxix. (containing many extracts from older writings, especially from Maimonides' More Nevochim. *Chr. A. Crusius* [Professor at Leipzig, died 1775, according to *Bleek*, p. 409, who says the first volume of his work is general, the other two taking up particular prophetic utterances, the third being exclusively on Israel]; hypomnemata ad theologiam prophetic., Lipsiæ 1764–78, 3 partes. *Hengstenberg*, die Beschaffenheit der Weissagung, in his

Christologie des Alt. Test. iii. 2, p. 158 ff. *J. Chr. K. Hofmann*, Weissagung u. Erfüllung im Alten u. Neuen Test., Nördlingen 1841–42, 2 vols. *Hävernick*, Einleit. ii. 2, pp. 1–57. *Franz Delitzsch*, die bibl. prophet. Theologie, ihre Fortbildung durch *Chr. A. Crusius*, und ihre neueste Entwickelung seit der Christol. von *Hengstenberg*, Leipzig 1845. [*Fairbairn* on Prophecy, Edinburgh 1856.]

The Rationalist view of prophecy, according to which the foretelling of the future is nothing else than a veiled delineation of the past, clothed in the form of prediction, is propounded by *Eichhorn*, Einl. vol. iv. In the widely diffused form, which makes predictions to be mere anticipations of sagacious politicians, and instances of foretelling to be *vaticinia ex eventu*, this view has been propounded by *August Knobel*, der Prophetismus der Hebr. vollst. dargestellt, Breslau 1838, 2 vols.; by *Ferd. Hitzig*, in the introduction to his Commentary on Isaiah; somewhat sublimated, by *Fr. Burch. Köster*, die Propheten des Alt. u. N. Test. nach ihren Wesen u. Wirken dargest., Leipzig 1838; and by *H. Ewald*, die Propheten des Alten Bundes erkl., Stuttgart 1840 f., 2 vols. (in the introduction to the first volume). Prophecy is treated from the Hegelian point of view in philosophy, by B. B. in *Tholuck's* litt. Anzeiger, 1834, Nos. 77–79, and 1835, Nos. 36–38 and 48–51; and in *Br. Bauer*, die Religion des Alten Test. ii. p. 221 ff. [*Bleek*, p. 409, refers, in addition, to *Redslob*, der Begriff des Nabi, Leipzig 1839; *Fr. Düsterdieck*, de rei propheticæ in Vet. Test. natura ethica, Gottingæ 1852; *Laur. Reinke* (Professor at Münster), Beitrr. zur Erklärung des Alten Test. vol. ii., Münster 1853; *Bunsen*, Gott in der Geschichte, vol. iii., Leipzig 1857.]

§ 61. *The Position of Prophecy in the Theocracy.*

In that preparatory remedial institution for the reconciliation of fallen man to God—the Old Testament economy resting on law and promise—prophecy forms an organic member, most intimately connected with the law as the foundation of the remedial institution. The law, with its commands and prohibitions, demands simple submission from man to the revealed will of the holy God, in all spheres and relations of life, so as to awaken the sense of need for redemption, by the working of the knowledge of sinful man's inability to give full and willing obedience to the command of God. In its sacrificial institutions the law certainly opened a way for the restoration of that fellowship of man with God which sin had violently broken off; for

Israel obtained a reconciliation with God by bringing the prescribed offerings, and entered into fellowship with the Lord by means of the priests whom He had sanctified. But this was only in a way which merely typified the true reconciliation, and which could not produce that real fellowship of life which is attained through the Spirit of God, but could only beget a longing for it. If the legal institution of the Old Testament was to become the right παιδαγωγὸς εἰς Χριστόν, prophecy must supervene upon the law; not only as the promise of divine grace and of future redemption, but also as a typical realizing of the promised gracious fellowship of the Lord with His people.

Prophecy opened a way for that which was an impossibility to the law; namely, for renewing the hearts of the people, for kindling and inflaming the love of God with all their heart and all their powers. In so far as the Spirit of the Lord came upon the prophets, not merely illuminating their knowledge, but also hallowing their lives, so that a man with the Spirit of the Lord upon him became another man (1 Sam. x. 6; Isa. vi. 7); so far did prophecy represent a union of the divine and the human,—an actual spiritual living fellowship with God, which not only pointed forward to the perfecting of the divine kingdom, in which the will of God is written on the hearts of men with living touches, and the Spirit of God dwells in the heart, but also offered already a real pledge of its being one day actually accomplished. And if in the *priesthood* the reconciliation between God and His people proceeds more directly from the latter [?], since the people appear before Jehovah in their priests chosen by God, and if the dedication to the Lord demanded by the theocratic covenant is consummated in the sacrificial service by the priests by means of atonement for their sins; then, on the other hand, in the *prophetic* office God consummates the reconciliation with the people through His Spirit, who opens up the eternal fundamental principles of the law, judges the present at every moment in accordance with these, and points forward and works towards the perfecting of the theocracy (1).

(1) Comp. the remarks, short but to the point, upon the reference of prophecy to the law, and the consequent position of the prophetic office in the theocracy, by *Oehler* in *Tholuck*, litt. Anzeiger, 1846, No. 32.—The view of *Knobel*, der Prophetism. i. p. 14 f., rests upon a total

mistake as to both the priesthood and the prophetic office: "The priests represent the theocracy according to the purely external exhibition of it, and they are administrators of the theocratic *forms*. The inspired prophets, on the contrary, represent the theocracy according to its *spirit* and *essence*. The prophets and the priests stand to each other in the relation of the *internal* and the *external*, the *essence* and the *form*."

The prophets do not at all stand above the law, in the sense of the law ceasing to be the absolute binding will of God, in any of its parts whatsoever. Yet they do open up a higher spiritual conception of the law, in which obedience to His word appears as the true sacrifice well pleasing to God (1 Sam. xv. 22); and they prepare the way for the time when the whole people should be consecrated by the Spirit of God to be organs of the divine will (Joel iii. 1 ff.; Jer. xxxi. 33 f.; Isa. liv. 13; Ezek. xxxvi. 26 f.). [Yet the opposition of the law and the prophets must be taken as comparative rather than absolute, since the law really rested on the promises to the fathers; and Moses was himself a prophet, with much that is prophetical in his writings, especially in Deuteronomy; and the texts now quoted are related to a most important passage in the history of the wandering, Num. xi., especially vers. 25–29.]—In this sense the prophets are interpreters, through whom God speaks to His people, revealing to them His will and His decrees; and not only unfolds the spirit of the law, but also announces beforehand His way of salvation and the future development of His kingdom.

The official name of the prophets is נָבִיא, "speaker," utterer of divine revelation (2); whereas the other appellations, חוֶֹה, "beholder," and רֹאֶה, "seer," are derived from the internal, spiritual intuition, as the medium through which the divine revelation was imparted to them (3).

(2) We arrive at this proper and original meaning of the word by means of Ex. vii. 1, where Aaron is called the *Nabî* of Moses—that is, the speaker for Moses, who was not mighty in discourse, as he is called the "mouth" of Moses, his organ of utterance, in iv. 16. Etymologically, too, this meaning is perfectly correct; comp. *Häv.* pp. 6, 7, and *Ewald*, die Propheten, i. p. 6.—The prophet is therefore called "the messenger of Jehovah," Hag. i. 13; also אִישׁ הָרוּחַ, "the

man of the Spirit," that is, impelled by the Spirit of God, Hos. ix. 7; or "man of God," Judg. xiii. 6, 8, 1 Sam. ii. 27, ix. 6, 10, 1 Kings xiii. 11 ff., and often, especially in the histories, like Moses in Deut. xxxiii. 1, Josh. xiv. 6, on the basis of Deut. xviii. 15, 18, xxxiv. 10. Universally the prophet comes forward in the name of Jehovah: his word is "the word of Jehovah" (Deut. xviii. 18; Hos. i. 1; Joel i. 1, etc., hence the frequent נְאֻם יְהוָה and אָמַר יְהוָה in the prophecies); and his disposal of events is precisely identical with God's, Jer. i. 10, Zech. xi. 4 ff. He is "the *servant* of Jehovah," Amos iii. 7, 2 Kings xvii. 13, Jer. vii. 25, and often; just as Moses was, Deut. xxxiv. 5, Josh. i. 1, 2, 13, 15, and often (comp. my Comm. on Joshua, p. 4). The priest is only "the *minister* of Jehovah," Num. xviii. 2, and often.—An erroneous etymological explanation of *Nabî* is "one on whom it has spouted or burst forth, a man laid hold of by the Spirit of God:" so *Redslob*, der Begriff des Nabi, Leipzig 1839, p. 3 ff.; [*Köster*, according to *Bleek*;] *De Wette*, Einl. § 202; *Knobel*, Prophetismus, i. p. 137 ff. [*Bleek*, pp. 412–13, agrees with *Keil*, referring to the parallel intransitive meaning of נָגִיר, נָעִיר, עָשִׁיר. Also, pp. 413–14, he notices its application to Abraham and the patriarchs, Gen. xx. 7, Ps. cv. 15; and Philo's view, that the prophet was God's ἑρμηνεύς, of which he quite approves, as of the Septuagint's προφήτης = ὑποφήτης = ἐξηγητής.]

(3) From 1 Sam. ix. 9, "He that is now called *Nabî* was beforetime called *Roeh*," it does not follow that "after Samuel's time common soothsaying was restrained by the prophetic office" (*De Wette*); but only that before Samuel's time, when prophecy was rare (1 Sam. iii. 1), the name which designated prophecy according to its true signification, for the theocracy had receded into the background in the consciousness of the people. [*Bleek*, p. 416, thinks that before Samuel's time the prophets were few, and did not come much forward to guide the people; that the name *Roeh* better suited their contemplative life than *Nabî*, "one who uttered," would have done. He also observes that *Hozeh* occurs only in Chronicles, except in 2 Sam. xxiv. 11, where it is applied to Gad, as it also is in 1 Chron. xxix. 29, where at the same time Samuel is called a *Roeh*, and Nathan a *Nabî*, probably because the chronicler found these persons so designated in the works which he cites.]

It results evidently from what has been said, that Old Testament prophecy can neither be identified nor placed on the same level with the system of oracles among the rest of the nations of antiquity. Prophecy is a gift of divine grace, by which the Old Testament legal

institution was conducted forward to its divinely appointed goal, and a preparation was made for restoring the fellowship of man with God which had been lost by sin. On the contrary, the divination or soothsaying of the heathen was not indeed originally a mere means of satisfying human curiosity, but proceeded from the belief that human life in all its relations was the object of a divine providence; yet, since it did not enjoy the light of divine revelation, it sought to satisfy that innate necessity of the human spirit, a knowledge of its fellowship with the Godhead, and a maintenance of continuous living intercourse with Him, by a way of its own, by means of presentiments and interpretations of signs (4).

(4) *Oehler*, *ib.* pp. 255–6: "Divination has ransacked heaven and earth, in order to find *signs* of the will which disposes of the destiny of man; it has descended into the depths of the human breast to gain acquaintance with the living God; and yet it was unable to find that knowledge of the counsel of God with which Old Testament prophecy was familiar."

This is the essential distinction between prophecy and divination (קֶסֶם, Num. xxii. 7), that prophecy rests upon divine inspiration, but divination upon mere presentiment of the human spirit, or imaginary loftier inspiration, or artificially-begotten enthusiasm: hence the prophet speaks only the words of Jehovah, the words which the Lord puts into his mouth, Deut. xviii. 18, [which even Balaam proclaimed to be his rule, however much falsehood may have been intermingled with his claims to be a prophet of Jehovah, Num. xxii. 8, 18, 19, 38, xxiii. 12, xxiv. 13]; while the soothsayers and the false prophets, on the contrary, speak out of their own hearts, Jer. xiv. 14, xxiii. 16, Ezek. xiii. 2 ff. It is, however, entirely mistaken by *Ewald*, who designates prophecy the original common good of all nations of superior antiquity; and he admits of no difference between the prophetic order in the Bible and the system of divination and soothsaying of the heathen, except this, that the former was refined to the purest form and conception by the pure spiritual religion of the old covenant, whereas the latter became degenerate by exaggeration, self-deception, and other abuses.

Upon the subject of the historical development of the prophetic order, and its relation to the kingly office, comp. *Häv.* p. 13 ff., and the supplementary remarks of *Oehler*, *ib.* p. 254.

§ 62. *Nature of Prophecy in reference to Subject-matter and Form.*

Prophecy does not spring from any natural parts whatsoever, or from any powers of the human spirit: its origin lies in a supernatural working (belonging to the kingdom of grace) of the Spirit of God upon the spirit of man, by which the prophets were furnished for being heralds to publish divine discourses, for being organs of the Holy Spirit (2 Pet. i. 21). But the divine decree and will, or the word of God, which they had to utter, was communicated to them through the medium of internal intuition of spiritual vision, as חָזוֹת, מַרְאָה. For the Spirit of God, which came upon them, elevated their spiritual being (knowledge, thinking, and feeling) into a higher sphere, a world of spirit exalted above the limits of the natural life of the spirit; and in this they perceived the voice of God, and cast glances into the future development of the kingdom of God, which were neither products of human thought and reflection upon divine revelation already given, nor mere presentiments or creations of a quick-sighted imagination, but contained objective divine truth. Yet we are not to think of the reception of this revelation, or the prophetic ecstasy, as a suppression of the intellectual consciousness by a violent working of the Divine Spirit, putting an end to the prophet's spiritual activity, and making his soul a purely passive vessel for the impressions and communications of the Spirit of God. Instead of this, it was an elevation of the human spirit to a degree of spiritual intuition such as lies quite beyond the limits of its natural ability; in which all the spiritual powers and capacities implanted in human nature were exalted, glorified, and enlightened, and furnished with supernatural powers from the Divine Spirit, for perceiving and uttering the divine revelations (1).

(1) The subjective nature of prophecy, as distinguished from divination, is thus determined by the Fathers, and by the older theologians: that the soothsayer found himself in an ecstatic state, his self-consciousness being suppressed; on the contrary, that the prophet spoke with a sober spirit, with clear and collected consciousness: *Jerome*, præf. in Jes.: "Neque vero, ut Montanus cum insanis feminis somniat, prophetæ in ecstasi loquuti sunt, ut nescirent quid loquerentur, et, cum alios erudirent, ipsi ignorarent quid dicerent." Procem. Nahum: "Non loquitur propheta ἐν ἐκστάσει, ut Montanus

et Priscilla Maximillaque delirant; sed quod prophetat, liber est visionis intelligentis universa quæ loquitur." Comp. his preface to Habakkuk. Still more distinctly *Chrysostom*, homil. 29, in ep. ad Cor.: τοῦτο γὰρ μάντεως ἴδιον, τὸ ἐξεστηκέναι, τὸ ἀνάγκην ὑπομένειν, τὸ ὠθεῖσθαι, τὸ ἕλκεσθαι, τὸ σύρεσθαι, ὥσπερ μαινόμενον. Ὁ δὲ προφήτης οὐχ οὕτως, ἀλλὰ μετὰ διανοίας νηφούσης καὶ σωφρονούσης καταστάσεως, καὶ εἰδὼς ἃ φθέγγεται, φησὶν ἅπαντα· ὥστε καὶ πρὸ τῆς ἐκβάσεως κἀντεῦθεν γνώριζε τὸν μάντιν καὶ τὸν προφήτην. See still more testimonies in *Rudelbach*, in the Zeitschrift f. d. luther. Theol. i. p. 28 ff. In this the Fathers were perfectly right. For while prophecy is not at all a product of reflective knowledge and thinking, but follows upon the reception of divine revelations by the inner sense of the immediate spiritual intuition; yet the divine communication does not in itself presuppose either a violent suppression of human consciousness (whether in reference to oneself or to the world), or yet in *every* case a trance or ecstasy, in which the external senses were at rest, and reflection retired into the background. Very often the prophets were fully conscious of everything external and internal, when they perceived the divine discourse in themselves or in their spirit; and in such a case the manner of revelation consisted only in this, "that the willing, thinking, feeling spiritual life of the prophet was lifted and carried along, in a condition of completely wakeful self-control, by a gentle divine influence, which it was indispensable that he could clearly distinguish from his own operations (2 Pet. i. 21)" (*Delitzsch*, bibl. Psychologie, p. 312). Yet often revelations were also imparted in the form of an ecstasy, which consists in this, "that the human spirit is seized and encompassed by the Divine Spirit, 'which searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God,' with such violence, that, diverted from its life in itself, and in the soul and in the body, it is absolutely and entirely a beholding eye, a listening ear, a perceiving sense, for the world beyond and to come, and for its concerns; because the violent operation of God has snatched it away into that sphere, out of the sphere in which its life is accustomed to move. Scripture names this ecstatic state γενέσθαι ἐν ἐκστάσει, Acts xxii. 17, or also γενέσθαι ἐν πνεύματι, Rev. i. 10." Yet even in this ecstasy the prophets retained "the capacity for bringing to an adequate and intelligible utterance what had been beheld ἐν πνεύματι, with the co-operation of the νοῦς and the physical energies" (*Delitzsch*, p. 313). —The view that the ecstatic character was essential to *every* prophecy, cannot be established from Scripture, even in the form which *Hengstb.* Christol. iii. 2, p. 160 ff. 2d ed., has given to the conception. Besides, comp. *Hāv.* ii. 2, p. 34 ff. [*Bleek*, p. 424, quite coincides in this

estimate of the view of *Hengstenberg;* as indeed he agrees throughout with the statements of this note. At p. 422 he gives the same extracts from *Chrysostom* and *Jerome,* and refers to the latter on Ephes. iii. 5, and to *Epiph.* Hæres. xlviii. 3, as also to a paper of his own in the Studien u. Kritiken, 1829, i. pp. 57–61. And at pp. 414–15 he observes that prophecy is so far removed from ecstasy, that properly what the μάντις uttered in dark, unconnected, ecstatic words, was to be explained by the προφήτης; and he refers to Plato, and to Pindar (*μαντεύεο, Μοῦσα, προφητεύσω δ' ἐγώ*), and to the citations in Schleusner.]

But if the inspiration of the prophets was neither simply subjective, a higher enthusiasm for divine truths, nor yet an inward speaking of the Divine Spirit which suspended the person's own spiritual life, or deprived him of distinct and collected consciousness; then the divine revelations and disclosures which were imparted to them in the higher intuition, could not be communicated immediately, but must have been in such a way as to find a point of attachment in the thinking and the spiritual life of the prophets. And thus it became possible for them to comprehend these in connection with that view of the world and of life which they had obtained through the revelation which already existed in the law and in the history, and to announce them in a form corresponding to their spiritual individuality, as well as the necessities of their contemporaries and countrymen. But this accommodation of divine revelation to the spiritual life of the prophet is not to be abused by drawing the inference from it, that the subject-matter of prophecies could neither transcend the prophet's political horizon, nor involve conceptions stretching beyond that stage in the divinely ordained and realized history of salvation which had been reached in any individual case. For though prophecy has for its object the future of salvation which is being prepared in history, yet it is not so bound down to the historical process as never to be able to outrun it, or to give more than "utterances of the present at that particular time, and of its significance for the final end." For it never denies its transcendent *origin,* which lies beyond the limits of human reason; or its transcendent *character,* elevated above history, over which it spreads its wings, disclosing, expounding, and determining the future, beforehand and beyond the germs apparent in the present (2).

(2) Rationalism denies the transcendent *origin* of prophecy; *Hofmann* (Weissag. u. Erfüll.) maintains the negative as to its transcendent *character*. In order to carry out the idea of an organic development of salvation, and to establish his view of the collective history of salvation as organically progressive, *Hofmann* mixes up and confuses the boundaries of freedom and necessity, and even of nature and grace, till he actually abolishes them, according to a fundamental view of soul and body which is psychologically untenable: and thus he binds prophecy to the historical process in such a way that it never can outrun it, so that nothing remains over except prophetic history, no room being left for revelation in words, or prophecy properly so called. Comp. *Delitzsch*, die prophet. Theol. p. 170 ff., where the fundamental errors of this work are discovered clearly, yet gently, and the relation of the history of salvation to prophecy is rightly determined thus: "History is the occasion of prophecy, but not its measure. History prophesies, because God is in it; prophecy does so, because God is superior to history. Prophecy soars above history, not history above prophecy. Prophecy has the historical present indeed for a foundation, but not for a sufficient reason. Prophecy receives those wings which carry it far away above the present, not from history, but from the omniscient God, who reveals to every particular time so much as He pleases, and as corresponds to its necessities. Though history may ever carry *under* its heart that which is to be the operating force in the next development, God carries the beginning, middle, and end of all history *in* His heart; and prophecy beholds as much of this as He opens to its spiritual eye." With this comp. *Stier*, Jesajas, p. vii. ff., and *Hengstb.* Christol. iii. 2, p. 121 ff.

It follows from this constitution and nature of prophecy, that it cannot give predictions of all sorts of accidental things, like soothsaying; it announces beforehand nothing else than events and relations which stand in organic and (though not always manifest, yet ever really existing) internal connection with the development of the kingdom of God within the divinely ordained limits of the theocracy. It also follows, that if it reveals events or conditions of the nearer or the more remote future, it represents the future configuration of the kingdom of God under forms and views of the earthly theocracy and its historical configuration. Out of this grows the problem in the exposition of the prophecies, how to grasp aright the relation of the form and drapery to the essence and reality; so as to find the truth which lies

between the two extremes, namely, materialistic mistakes as to the figurative character, and spiritualistic volatilization of the real forms of the kingdom of God (3).

(3) In general, the exposition of the rabbins and of the rationalists inclines to a crude realism: in the former, on account of carnal Messianic expectations; in the latter, from dogmatic prejudice, which can acknowledge nothing more than "unrealized, ideal, fanatical hopes" in the concrete and detailed predictions of the future. On the contrary, the Fathers often fell into a false spiritualism. There are good remarks on this in *Hengstb.* Christol. iii. 2, p. 194 ff.; with which comp. *Häv.* p. 49 ff., *Delitzsch,* proph. Theol. p. 165 ff. [*Bleek's* views do not appear to be decided. At pp. 432–3 he says some of the prophets were men with much knowledge of business; yet their admission that they could not give an answer till God granted them light, and their constant advice to cling to Jehovah alone, even in the utmost danger, are decisive against the notion that they were mere politicians. Along with this, however, he makes the concession that some things were not fulfilled which they foretold; though of this he gives no instance. At pp. 436–7 he seems to confine the predictive elements to certain individualizing circumstances, on which he thinks the truth of a prophecy as a whole would not have been made to depend by the prophets themselves. At pp. 437–9 he says the prophecies have much of a Messianic character, taking this expression in the broad sense of a fulfilment of the promise to Abraham; yet sometimes they were more outward and political, sometimes more national, sometimes without any connection with a human deliverer, and sometimes the reverse.]

It follows from this, as regards the *form* of prophecy *in general,* that the prophets in the Spirit behold the future as if it were present; that to their spirit the images and configurations of the future appear as present, as already actual realities. This explains not only the predominant use of the so-called prophetic perfect in predictive discourses, but also the fact that the chronological order of the predicted events retires into the background, prophecy assuming a so-called perspective character (4). This prophetic perspective is certainly not to be considered as an entire abstraction from the relations of time, nor as a mixture of nearer and more remote objects, just as in a correct picture things nearer and more distant do not melt into one

another; its reason lies in the real and causal connection of the individual phases of development in the kingdom of God (5). Accordingly, the prophets not only represent the various operating forces of their predictions under the relation of cause and effect; but they also give chronological statements, both in general terms (אַחֲרִית־כֵּן), and also in individual cases, very determinately (for instance, Isa. vii. 8; Jer. xxv. 11, xxix. 10). Yet these individual determinate numbers occupy only a subordinate position in the prophecies, and they are mostly of a symbolical nature (6), because the aim of prophecy is not to give a historical description of future events, but to represent the stages of the development of the kingdom of God in its internal and necessary progress; for which purpose statements of years and days are rather of accidental than of essential significance.—*In particular*, again, the form of prophecy assumes manifold shapes, since what is strictly called discourse interchanges with visions and symbolical acts. *Prophetic discourse*, as the predominant form of prophecy, consists partly in discourses actually spoken to the people (Isa. vii., xxxvi. 6, 7, 21 ff.; Amos vii. 10 ff.; Jer. xxi., xxviii. 5 ff.; Ezek. xiv. 1 ff., and others), partly in discourses skilfully elaborated, destined for communication only in a written form; whose diction often approaches closely to simple prose, yet without ever passing wholly over into it, but always retaining firmly its oratorical character in the rhetorical parallelism of its clauses, and which, again, often rises to lofty poetry, even into lyrical songs.—The *vision* is no arbitrary drapery, no merely artificial form of representation (7); it is the immediate description of the spiritual intuitions under the veil of significant images or symbols, in which shape the spirit of the prophet has received them. The *symbolical action* rests upon the extremest liveliness of representation; the personality of the prophet being so interwoven with the intuition, that he appears to be acting, as representative of one of the two factors in every prophecy, as substitute for either God or the people. It is the external embodiment of the internal intuition, in which it is not of material importance whether the action has been performed externally or internally; that is to say, whether it has been executed in the domain of external activity, or has taken place only in the spirit of the prophet (8). In the latter case, the symbolical action is nearly allied to the vision,—only

that in the vision the prophet comes forward, not as an actor in the intuition, but, as it were, as a mere spectator of his internal intuition, and he simply relates what he has beheld in spirit. The beauty and sublimity of the visions lie partly in the object, in the symbols themselves as they are beheld, partly in the pictorial description of them.—In these two forms (visions and symbolical actions) we see most distinctly how prophecy rests on internal spiritual intuition; although there is always an internal intuition at the foundation of the simple prophetic discourse also,—only it is not rendered immediately, but is uttered in thoughts and words after having been spiritually elaborated. But the internal reason for those two forms lies partly in the individuality of the prophets, and the circumstances by which they are surrounded; partly in the nature of the object, the theophanies for instance; and lastly, partly in the deeper impression intended to be produced by the prophecy, inasmuch as an action makes a greater impression than words do upon those who hear them (9).

(4) Already intimated by *J. A. Bengel* (comp. his Life by *Burk*, 1831, p. 354); carried out further by *Velthusen*, de optima rerum futur. descriptione ad illustr. l. Jes. 63, reprinted in Commentatt. theol. by *Velthusen*, *Kuinöl*, and *Ruperti*, vi. p. 75 sqq.; *Jahn*, Einl. ii. p. 368 ff.; and *Häv.* p. 45 f.

(5) So, for instance, the connection of the deliverance of Israel from the exile with the redemption of God's people by Messiah; the view obtained simultaneously of the judgment going forth upon the Assyrian or Babylonian universal monarchy, and of the judgment of the world; and others besides.

(6) *Beck*, Einl. in das System der christl. Lehre, p. 201: "The prophetic numbers are composed by combination, partly from the most internal primeval determinations of the relations of extra-mundane measures, holy primeval numbers measuring the elementary organization of the world, to unriddle which nothing is of service besides that which the Bible discloses as to creation and primeval time,—partly from the fundamental determinations of the theocratic chronology and arithmetic (particularly the computations for the festivals), holy cyphers, extracted from the theocratic regulations of time and measure." [What does this precisely mean?]

(7) As *Knobel*, i. p. 170 ff., *De Wette*, § 205, *Köster*, d. Proph. p. 272 ff., and others maintain, on the supposition that prophecy is mere anticipation; and of course with extremely superficial reasons. Comp. against them, *Häv.* p. 39.

(8) Most of the symbolical actions of the prophets, though not the whole of them, are to be understood as internal occurrences (comp. *Stäudlin*, neue Beitrr. zur Erkl. der Proph. [1791], p. 123 ff., [and pp. 220, 240, says *Bleek*, p. 426, note]. But in no case are they to be set down as nothing more than means of illustration (*Knobel*, i. p. 420): a circumstance which is decisive against this opinion is their own frequent obscurity, so that they themselves need an explanation; comp. *Häv.* p. 42. [*Bleek*, pp. 426–7, thinks that the symbolical actions had an outward reality in the case of the older prophets, who published their messages by word of mouth; but as to the later ones, who confined themselves mostly to written communications, he very much agrees with *Stäudlin*. To some slight extent he is disposed to a similar opinion in regard to the visions, though refusing to hold with *Köster* that this was usually the case, p. 423. Agreeing with *Hengstenberg* that these symbolical actions were visions, he says in this they follow Kimchi, Aben Ezra, and Maimonides Moreh Nebochim, P. ii. cap. 46. At p. 514 f. he observes that the symbolical actions of Ezekiel were not performed by him in the actual world, since even so they would not have been instructive to the persons for whom they were intended; and at p. 520 f. he rejects the notion that Hosea performed his symbolical actions outwardly, in which instance we shall find *Keil* agreeing with his opinion, § 83, Note 3.]

(9) A vision was unavoidable in the case of theophanies, since God can be beheld only in a symbolical shape, and through a veil. The predominance of visions in Ezekiel and Zechariah has its foundation in the personality of these prophets, and in the influence exerted upon Ezekiel, in particular, by heathenism with its numerous symbols: it by no means justifies the inference that prophetic symbolism was a form of representation arbitrarily selected.

§ 63. *The Literature of the Prophecies.*

Although the beginnings of prophecy go back to the time of Moses, and though specially from Samuel there arose an unbroken succession of prophets, yet the prophetic literature begins first in the ninth century B.C. It is true that the earlier prophets occupied themselves with literary composition also, and drew up their weightier utterances in a written form; as appears evidently from the authorities quoted in the books of Chronicles, which form the basis of our historical books. Yet as their activity was destined almost exclusively for the present, it was sufficient to record in writing what they

effected in word and deed for the guidance of the theocracy; of which all that is essential has been set down in the prophetical books of history (1).

It was quite different from the ninth century and onwards, as the period dawned in which the great Asiatic universal monarchies arose, destined by God to be the rod for chastising His persistently rebellious people, and the executioners of that punishment with which Moses had already threatened the stiff-necked transgressors of His commandments, expelling from the Holy Land the degenerate kingdoms of Israel and Judah. Then prophecy was charged with a more comprehensive task, one which stretched away beyond the immediate present into the entire future of the kingdom of God. On the one hand, the necessity was now introduced for manifesting Jehovah's omnipotence and omniscience, in opposition to the apparent superiority of the gods of the heathen, as this became prominent in the victory of the worldly powers over the theocracy; and thus, for setting aside every occasion or inducement to doubt of the true Godhead of the Lord of hosts: this was accomplished when God the Lord revealed His judgments beforehand by His prophets to His people Israel, and announced to them that He, the God of heaven and earth, abandoned His people and His inheritance to the kings of the heathen for chastisement; yet that He also possessed the power of bringing to nothing all those kingdoms of the earth whose kings and peoples did not acknowledge His glory. On the other hand, there was now a need for preparing a light in the darkness for the penitent and believing members of the theocracy, in view of the coming times of tribulation in which the Lord must give up His people into the power of the heathen; as also for opening up a fountain of consolation, by announcing the glorification of the theocracy (subsequent to the judgments) by Messiah and His kingdom, so as to guard against despondency and despair, even when the heaviest judgments might break forth.—This problem the prophets solved in and with their prophetic writings, as they wrote out their prophecies under a divine impulse, and by a divine command (2),—doing this partly beforehand, for the sake of communicating them to their contemporaries, partly after having delivered them orally; the written form being sometimes unabbreviated, and sometimes the mere quintessence of the addresses

publicly delivered, containing only what was essential. These they handed over to their contemporaries and to posterity in well-arranged collections or books (3).

When the prophetic books were united to form one whole, the collection was so arranged as to concede the first place to those who were rightly considered "the greater prophets" (4), on account of the great richness of their prophecies — namely, Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel; then, after them, united into the one book of "the twelve apostles," those writings of minor compass by the remaining prophets. And the entire collection of predictive books was placed at the side of the prophetic books of history, since the historical books represented the theocracy in the past, as the books of prophecy represented it in the future.

(1) [*Bleek*, p. 417 f., notices the position assigned to Samuel at the head of the prophets, in Acts iii. 24, Heb. xi. 32, as Samuel is called "the teacher of all prophets" in the Jerusalem Targum, tract Chaggiga, fol. 77; and so *Augustine*, civit. Dei, xvii. 1, makes the prophetic period begin with Samuel. Again, he observes that in 1 Macc. ix. 27, iv. 46, xiv. 41, this prophetic period is acknowledged to be past, and the people are taught that they must wait for a new prophet.] The remark of *De Wette*, § 206, is quite erroneous: "The oldest prophets seem to have noted nothing down, probably because living discourse and deeds were of more value at that time, and because composition was not yet sufficiently in vogue." Against this, comp. *Hengstb.* Christol. i. p. 179 f. [*Bleek*, p. 424, says that at first the prophets represented orally anything they had to tell, without writing it themselves, or procuring it to be done for them; and thus, for centuries after Samuel, there is nothing preserved to us of the fuller prophetic utterances; yet that certain of these utterances were full of life to a very high degree, in the language of lyric poetry, and, like it, accompanied by music. In support of this he appeals to 1 Sam. x. 5, 6, 2 Kings iii. 15, and to the use of *Nabî* in 1 Chron. xxv. 1.]

(2) The divine command to write is often remarked; comp. Isa. viii. 1; Hab. ii. 2, 3; Jer. xxix. 1 f., xxxvi. 1, 2; and, with the express declaration that the prophecy has a significance for the future, Isa. xxx. 8; Jer. xxx. 2, 3.

(3) The opinion which has been spread widely by the rationalistic criticism, that many prophecies were in circulation as "fly-leaves," and that first at some later time the collections assumed shape, and the

books of the prophets were edited, by which process the uncritical and the accidental have joined hands unsuspectingly and carelessly (*Eichhorn, Gesenius, De Wette, Hitzig*, and others; comp. *Knobel*, i. p. 434 ff.), is destitute of any foundation that is even moderately secure. The prolix discussion of this point by *Ewald* (Propheten, i. pp. 53–64) contains much more of fiction and of fancy than of real truth. With the exception of the book of Jeremiah (comp. § 76), there is in truth nothing to show editing or collection by a later or by a strange hand.

(4) [*Bleek*, p. 517, quotes *Jerome*, procem. in Esaiam: "Cum Esaias duodecim prophetis juxta numerum versuum aut æqualis aut major sit;" and *Augustine*, de civit. Dei, xviii. 29: "Qui propterea dicuntur minores, quia sermones eorum sunt breves in eorum comparatione qui majores ideo vocantur, quia prolixa volumina condiderunt."

A. THE GREATER PROPHETS (נְבִיאִים גְּדוֹלִים).

ISAIAH (יְשַׁעְיָה).

Commentaries:—*Casp. Sanctius, Maldonatus; Zwingli, Œcolampadius, Musculus, Calvin; Brentius, Selneccer, Seb. Schmidt; Coccejus, Clericus, Vitringa, Rosenmüller, Maurer;* see § 224 sq. *Rob. Lowth*, New translation of Isaiah, with critical, philological, and explanatory remarks [13th ed. London 1844]; translated into German by *Richerz;* with additions and remarks by *J. B. Koppe*, Göttingen 1779–81, 4 Thle.—Comp. *D. Koecher*, Vindiciæ textus hebr. Esaiæ adversus Lowthii criticam, Bern. 1786. Esaias ex rec. textus Hebr. Latine vertit et notas subj. *J. Chr. Doederlein*, Lipsiæ, ed. 3, 1789. *H. E. G. Paulus*, Philol. Clavis üb. d. Alt. Test. Jesaja, Jena 1793. Der Prophet Jesaja übersetzt mit einem vollst. philol. krit. u. histor. Comment. begleitet v. *Wilh. Gesenius*, Leipzig 1820–21, 3 Thle. Der Prophet Jesaja übersetzt u. ausgelegt von *F. Hitzig*, Heidelberg 1833. Des Proph. Jesaja Weissagungen. Chronol. geordnet, übersetzt u. erklärt von *C. L. Hendewerk*, 2 Thle. Königsberg 1838 and 1843. *F. W. C. Umbreit*, prakt. Comm. über den Jesaja mit. exeg. u. krit. Anmerkk., Hamburg 1841, 2 Thle. 2d ed. 1846. *H. Ewald*, die Proph. des Alten Bundes erkl., 2 Bde., Stuttgart 1840–41. *M. Drechsler*, der Proph. Jesaja übersetzt u. erklärt, 3 Thle. (Th. ii. 2 and iii., edited by *Franz Delitzsch*, and *Aug. Hahn*), Stuttgart and Berlin 1845–57. *Aug. Knobel*, d. Proph. Jesaja erklärt, Leipzig 1843, 2d

ed. 1853 (Lief. 5 of the kurzgefasst. exeg. Handbuch). *E. Meier*, d. Proph. Jes. übers., first half, Pforzheim 1850. *F. Beck*, die cyrojesaj. Weissag. krit. u. exeget. bearb., Leipzig 1844. *R. Stier*, Jesaias, nicht Pseudo-Jesaias. Ausleg. seiner Weissagung, Cap. 40–66, Barmen 1850. [*F. Delitzsch*, Comm., Leipzig 1866; English translations, with notes, by *E. Henderson*, London 1846, and *J. A. Alexander*.]

For introduction:—*A. F. Kleinert*, üb. d. Echtheit sämmtlicher in dem B. Jesaia enthalt. Weissagg., 1 Th. Berlin 1829. *C. P. Caspari*, Beitrr. zur Einl. in d. B. Jesaia, u. zur Geschichte der Jesaian. Zeit., Berlin 1848. [The Messianic interpretation of the prophecies of Isaiah, by R. Payne Smith, Oxford 1862].

§ 64. *The Person of the Prophet.*

Of the person of Isaiah (יְשַׁעְיָהוּ), and of the circumstances of his life, we know only that he was the son of *Amoz* (i. 1), a man of whom nothing more is known (1); that he lived in Jerusalem; that he was married, and had two sons (vii. 3, viii. 3, 18) (2); that he prophesied under the kings Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah (i. 1); that is to say, he made his appearance as a prophet in the year that king Uzziah died [*Bleek*, p. 449, believes after Uzziah's death (however, compare the expression, ch. xiv. 28); and he draws the presumptuous inference that there is an error in the title, ch. i. 1], and was still at work as a prophet in the fifteenth year of Hezekiah (vi. 1, xxxvi. xxxix.). How long after this his active service continued, we cannot determine with certainty; yet hardly till the time of Manasseh's reign (3).

(1) The rabbinical tradition which makes *Amoz* a brother of king Amaziah (Gemar. Megil. f. 10, c. 2) rests upon mere combination of names, without historical foundation. *Kimchi* himself, on Isa. i. 1, says, "We do not know his lineage, nor of what tribe he was." The identification of Amoz (אמוץ) with the prophet Amos (עמוס) by Clemens Alex. and some other Fathers, has arisen from ignorance of the Hebrew, in which the names are very different, whereas in Greek both sound Ἀμώς. Against this, see already *Jerome*, procem. ad Amos. Comp. *Carpzov*, introd. iii. p. 91 sq.

(2) The opinion of *Gesenius* and others, that the עַלְמָה, vii. 14, was a (second) wife, and Immanuel, vii. 14, viii. 8, also a son of the prophet, is supported by a false interpretation of these passages.

(3) Rabbins and Christian interpreters have, on insufficient

grounds, inferred that Isaiah appeared so early as in the first years of Uzziah's government (*Abarbanel*), or several years before his death, —partly from 2 Chron. xxvi. 22, partly from the position of Isa. vi., and from a false interpretation of נִרְמֵיתִי, vi. 5. Also, the extension of his active life until the time of Manasseh is founded partly on thoroughly insecure exegetical assumptions—as, for instance, *Gesenius* places the oracle (ch. xix.) in Manasseh's time, and *Möller*, de authentia oracc. Esai. c. 40–66, Hafniæ 1825, p. 121 sqq., makes these chapters be composed during the exile of this king; compare against this *Kleinert*, p. 24 ff.;—partly on the unwarranted rabbinical and patristic legend [*Bleek*, p. 450, says it is found in the Talmud, tr. Jebamoth, f. 49, 2, Sanhedrin, f. 103, 2, and in various rabbins; and also in *Justin Martyr*, dial. c. Tryph. p. 349, *Tertullian*, de patientia, c. 14, and other Fathers; and, finally, in an apocryphal writing of Isaiah, the *Ἀναβατικόν*. He himself thinks the report not unlikely to be true], to which probably an allusion may already be made in Heb. xi. 37, that our prophet suffered martyrdom under Manasseh by the sword or the saw. Comp. *Gesenius*, Comment. i. p. 9 ff., *Häv.* Einl. ii. 2, p. 59. Even if Isaiah lived to see the administration of Manasseh, which is quite possible, yet, on account of the superscription (i. 1), we dare not bring down any of his prophecies to the time of this king. [*Bleek*, p. 450, says we may be pretty certain that Isaiah's life of Hezekiah extended to the death of that king, calling attention to the language, 2 Chron. xxxii. 32.]

Our prophet lived midway between Moses and Christ, and his active life falls in that crisis (so important and full of results to the theocracy) of the conflict of the Assyrian power with the kingdoms of Israel and Judah in its struggle with the great Egyptian monarchy for the sovereignty of the world. "Isaiah had this peculiar mission to Israel, that he must accompany, introduce, and explain the earliest, preliminary, and typical realization of the threatenings which the Lord had expressed by Moses against Israel in the event of their unfaithfulness" (4). This crisis resulted in two equally decisive moments for the development of the theocracy under the administrations of Ahaz and of Hezekiah. Under the former, when the allied Syrians and Israelites invaded Judah, the culpable unbelief of the ungodly Ahaz brought Judah into actual danger, and threatened greater destruction in the future; under the latter, when Sennacherib invaded Judah, pious Hezekiah's believing confidence in the Lord issued in

the annihilation of the Assyrian host; and in this triumph the pious members of the theocracy received the pledge of victory over every form of the ungodly worldly power. In accordance with this, the prophetic activity of Isaiah assumed different forms. To the unbelieving he announced the divine judgments in the whole of their extent; to the pious believers he prophesied redemption throughout the whole series of judgments, until the glorious consummation of the theocracy (5).

(4) Comp. the sketch admirably unfolding Isaiah's position in relation to his time, and the importance of it, in *Drechsler*, i. p. 3 ff.

(5) Jesus Sirach, xlviii. 25, says of Isaiah, in consequence: ἕως τοῦ αἰῶνος ὑπέδειξε τὰ ἐσόμενα καὶ τὰ ἀπόκρυφα πρὶν ἢ παραγενέσθαι αὐτά; and ver. 24, πνεύματι μεγάλῳ εἶδε τὰ ἔσχατα, καὶ παρεκάλεσε τοὺς πενθοῦντας ἐν Σιών.

Among all the prophetic books of the Old Covenant, the prophecies of Isaiah occupy the foremost place, whether we estimate this by their size, or by their subject-matter. His discourses reveal a wonderful loftiness and depth in his spirit, as it looked through and through both the present and the future, and explained the whole in the light of divine truth. Isaiah testified, as no other prophet has done, of the sovereign rule of the Holy One in Israel; he announced the downfall of everything high and great on earth; and he summoned notable sinners, living in security, to the law and to the testimony. But at the same time, to the lowly and depressed pious ones he unfolded with such clearness the unending glory and superabundant fulness of Jehovah's salvation, as it was to arise on the remnant of Israel, escaped from the judgments, and returning to their God, that he has been named the Evangelist of the Old Testament, on account of the great richness of his Messianic prophecies (6).

(6) *Jerome*, præf. ad Jes. ad Paulam et Eustoch.: "Non tam propheta dicendus est quam Evangelista; ita enim universa Christi ecclesiæque mysteria ad liquidum prosecutus est, ut non putes eum de futuris vaticinari, sed de præteritis historiam texere." See other similar expressions of other Fathers in *Carpzov*, p. 95, *Gesenius*, i. p. 41.

The form of representation is also in correspondence with the

deep and lofty, the rich and many-sided subject-matter of these prophecies. The language of our prophet is not only clear, noble, powerful, rich in thought and in imagery,—it is also lofty, forcible, poetical, and rhetorical. Where he threatens and rebukes, it is earnest, compressed, and brief; on the contrary, where he announces salvation, it is mild, friendly, speaking to the heart, and artistic in its delineation. But it is ever in entire correspondence with the subject-matter: with calm majesty it governs all its forms, conversational, rhetorical, and lyrical; and with exquisite tact it uses the right expression for every object at every time (7).

(7) The eloquence of Isaiah is extolled by the Fathers, by *Luther*, and by all the expositors, older and more recent. Comp. for instance *Gesenius*, i. p. 36 ff.; *Umbreit*, i. p. xxviii. ff.; *Ewald*, Proph. i. p. 166: "All the powers and all the beauties of prophetic discourse meet in Isaiah, in order to be mutually balanced there; it is less any single quality that distinguishes him, than the symmetry and perfection of the whole" (p. 173). "Yet still this remains the principal thing, that we cannot give the special peculiarity and the favourite colouring of the whole description in Isaiah as we can in the other prophets. He is not pre-eminently the lyrical, or the elegiac, or the rhetorical and hortatory prophet; like Joel perhaps, or Hosea, or Micah, in whom there is more of some peculiar predominating colouring. But ever, as the subject may require, he has at command every kind of expression, and every change of representation; and this is here the very foundation of his greatness, as everywhere it is one of his most prominent excellences. His fundamental excellence is just the lofty, majestic tranquillity of his discourse, proceeding from his perfectly secure mastery of the subject," etc.

§ 65. *Contents and Arrangement of the Book of Isaiah.*

The individual discourses and portions of this book have been arranged and placed together, neither purely chronologically in the order of time, nor merely in the material order according to homogeneousness of subject-matter; but according to a principle of successive unfolding of his prophetic activity, which resulted from the historical course that his mission ran. This has so combined them into one complete whole, with a well-contrived connection and a constant development, that chronological relations and homogeneous-

ness of subject-matter are brought into finest harmony with this principle (1).

(1) Chronological arrangements were searched for in the book by *Jerome, J. H. Michaelis, Rosenmüller, Hengstb.* Christol. ii. p. 3 ff: an arrangement according to subjects was approved by *Vitringa, Jahn, Greve* (ultima capp. Jes., p. 2 sqq.), and others (comp. *Gesenius*, i. p. 18 ff.), against whom *Koppe, Augusti, Eichhorn, Bertholdt, Hitzig*, p. xxxvii. ff., *Ewald*, i. p. 177 ff., and bibl. Jahrb., vii. p. 28 ff., found nothing but unbounded confusion in the book. *Gesenius* propounded the mediating view, that the collection fell into four books, in which both of these principles of arrangement appeared; but that neither principle was carried fully out, and that the collection had manifestly come into existence by degrees, and through the amalgamation of several partial collections (of which there lie at the foundation, according to *Ewald, seven* writings published by Isaiah himself). *Häv.* also, p. 64 ff., distinguishes four books or groups of prophecies—ch. i.-xii., xiii.-xxiii., xxiv.-xxxix., and xl.-lxvi; at the same time, however, he seeks to show that the disposition of the entire collection has been according to a fixed plan, and that it has been preserved accurately and excellently in an arrangement which has been carried out in conformity with that plan. *Drechsler*, Comment. i. p. 30 ff., was the first to recognise and set forth the right principle of arrangement.

The entire mission of our prophet has for its object and central point the two events of his time which constituted epochs for the theocracy; namely, the expedition against Jerusalem made by the allied kings of Syria and Ephraim, and the invasion of Judah by Sennacherib. With reference to these events, the individual elements in the book of Isaiah are organically arranged into *two great groups* of prophecies, in such a way that the words of the prophet spoken in regard to these events form the kernel and focus of each of these groups; while the remaining prophecies are subordinated to these, either preceding as preparatory and opening up the way, or succeeding them to carry them out still further, and to develope their consequences for the future of the kingdom of God.

1. The former of these events was a test sent from God for Judah and the house of David, in which it was their duty to decide in favour of faith and confidence simply in the omnipotence and the grace of

the Lord; instead of which, they placed their confidence in the earthly worldly power of Assyria, and, as a punishment, were given over to this worldly kingdom, and by it were drawn into the secular historical process of the heathen nations, in order that, being purified by severe judgments, they might be led through deep sufferings to the glory of their divine calling. The *first* group of the prophecies of our book refers to this event and its consequences for the theocracy, ch. ii.–xxvii. (*a*) Its kernel is formed by the cycle, ch. ii.–xii., whose centre lies in the history of the invasion of Judah by the allied kings of Syria and Ephraim, and the prophecy spoken on occasion of this event, ch. vii. This event is preceded by hortatory and warning utterances: nearest to it is ch. vi., the announcement of the judgment of hardening upon Israel, and its consequences, along with the calling of the prophet; and then, ch. ii.–iv., the exhortation recalling to memory Israel's true and false glory; and, ch. v., the threatening of the judgment of rejection and abandonment upon the theocracy fallen from its calling. To the event in ch. vii. there are four utterances and discourses of the prophet attached, to complete it and form one whole with it: (*a*) ch. viii. 1–4, the utterance about Maher-shalal-hashbaz; (*β*) viii. 5–ix. 6, the discourse about Immanuel, which resolves the contradiction between the downfall of Israel and its divine destiny; (*γ*) ix. 7–x. 4, the delineation of the judgment as a total and radical sifting of the two houses of Israel; (*δ*) x. 5–xii. 6, the prophecy of the false and of the true universal monarchy, or of the overthrow of the Assyrian worldly power, and of the erection of the kingdom of Messiah. (*b*) As a wider development of this group, there follows a cycle of prophecies, ch. xiii.–xxiii., which are occupied with the world conceived of as in revolt against the Lord, and announce the judgment which is breaking forth upon all kingdoms and nations, cities and individuals, that stand in opposition to God: and they carry out the ideas, how all the kingdoms of the earth and all the world shall be compelled to seek salvation from the Lord the God of Israel, or, failing to do this, shall be necessarily annihilated; and how the strangest and the remotest heathen shall one day bring their gifts to the Lord for the upbuilding of His kingdom (2). (*c*) The conclusion of this group is contained in a closing discourse, which takes a survey of the preceding prophecies as a whole, and gives that turn

to affairs which determines the final condition of all things, ch. xxiv.–xxvii. (3).

(2) The series opens with *Babel*, as the seat of the Chaldee government, the heir and continuator of the Assyrian worldly power (xiii. 1–xiv. 27); then follow the countries bordering on the kingdom of Judah, the *Philistines* (xiv. 28–32), the *Moabites* (xv. xvi.), the allied *Syria* and *Ephraim*, together with the Assyrian host (xvii. xviii.); then the great southern power, *Egypt* (xix.), and the distant *Ethiopia* (xx.); again, *Babylon*, as the metropolis of sensuality and idolatry (xxi. 1–10), *Edom* (xxi. 11, 12), the *Arabs* (xxi. 13–17), *Jerusalem* (xxii. 1–14), the high official *Shebna* and his successor *Eliakim* (xxii. 15–25); finally, the island-state in the western sea, *Tyre* (xxiii.). In order to "express the idea of generality spreading over the whole world," there are brought together "nations of the present era, and also nations of the future (comp. xiii. 1–xiv. 27). Among the nations are represented both mainland and sea (xxiii.), wilderness (xxi. 13–17) and cultivated land (xix.). Here nations are taken in which are destitute of social ties (xxi. 13–17), nations with a political organization (xix.), universal monarchies (xiii. 1–xiv. 27); also towns (xxi. 1–10, xxii. 1–14), and individuals (xxii. 15–25). Here are both great and small nations: here is Assyria, casting everything down before it (x. 5–34, xiv. 24–27, xvii. 12–xviii. 7), and those who fall before Assyria (xiv. 28–32, xv., xvi., etc.); those whom Assyria was unable to overcome (xix.), and those who are as yet untouched by the intercourse of the world (xviii. 1, 2, 7). Here is the city of the sanctuary (xxii. 1–14) included side by side with the city of the apostasy (xxi. 1–10). Here the very remotest have a share (xviii. xx.), not less than the nearest neighbours—the nations allied by blood, not less than those who are utter strangers."—*Drechsler*, ii. p. 14.

(3) *Drechsler*, i. p. 35, sums up its contents in these words: "Israel having entered in the first place, it is true, into one fellowship with the heathen nations in punishment, in suffering, and in destruction, will emerge from this to the glory of the Lord. Afterwards the heathen nations will be gathered to Israel into the fellowship of blessedness, so far as they do not stand in the way of their own salvation." Comp. with this, vol. ii. p. 3, 169 f.

2. The second principal event of that time was the crisis introduced by Sennacherib's invasion, or the judgment going forth upon the worldly power at enmity with God, through the annihilation of

the Assyrian host; with this the *second* group of the prophecies of our book is occupied, ch. xxviii.–lxvi. (*a*) Paving the way for this event, as it precedes it, there is the cycle of prophecies, ch. xxviii.–xxxv.; namely, (*α*) the discourses pronounced in view of this judgment, in reference to the affliction impending over the theocracy in its struggle with the Assyrian power of Sennacherib, and its own internal corruption, and its future victory over all internal and external enemies (xxviii.–xxxiii.); (*β*) in reference to the completed judgments upon the hostile worldly powers, represented by Edom, and the glorious redemption of the people of God (xxxiv. xxxv.). (*b*) Ch. xxxvi.–xxxix. form the kernel and centre of this group: (*α*) the narrative of Sennacherib's invasion, and of the miraculous annihilation of his host (xxxvi. xxxvii.); (*β*) the consequences of this divine act in favour of the theocracy, the gracious respite which intervened (xxxviii.), and the new testing, with the announcement of further heavier judgments for the future (xxxix.). (*c*) The conclusion of the second group, and at the same time of the whole book, is comprised in the cycle of prophetic discourses as to the future of Israel (xl.–lxvi.). This presents to us the completion of Isaiah's prophetic activity in a grand comprehensive picture; which may be viewed as combined into the unity of one greater whole, and organically arranged in three well-proportioned sections, which are marked off by verses forming a refrain (xlviii. 22, lvii. 21, lxvi. 24). The fullest and most comprehensive Old Testament development of the redemption of Israel and its glorification into the true kingdom of God, is given in these chapters, resting on the basis of the Babylonish captivity announced to Hezekiah in ch. xxxix. 5-7. The *first* of these sections (ch. xl.–xlviii.) represents the relation of Israel to heathendom; and out of the redemption of Israel from Babylon, by means of Cyrus the servant of God, developes the infallible victory of the theocracy over the idols and the powers of the heathen world. The *second* section (ch. xlix.–lvii.) represents Israel as the seat of salvation for the world, by carrying out the thought, that as Cyrus redeemed Israel out of the bondage of Babylon, so the true Servant of Jehovah, by His vicarious sufferings and death, should atone for sins, should exalt the covenant people to true glory, and should make it the centre of salvation for the whole world, by setting up the ever-enduring grace promised to

David [English version, "sure mercies of David"] (lv. 3). Finally, in the *third* section (lviii.–lxvi.), after an exhortation, confessing and denouncing the sins of the people (lviii. lix.), a series of majestic images announces the glorification of the theocracy into the completed kingdom of God, along with the creation of new heavens and of a new earth (4).

(4) Comp. *Häv.* p. 150 ff.—The organic arrangement of this cycle into *three* sections, discovered by *Fr. Rückert* (hebr. Propheten übersetzt u. erläut., 1 Lief., Leipzig 1831, p. 1), acknowledged, too, by *Hitzig*, Jesai. p. 457, and by *Häv.* p. 153, is disputed by *De Wette*, Einl. p. 282, who assumes the turning-point and commencement of a new section to be at lvi. 9; but he is wrong, for the denunciation which comes in here forms simply the reverse or counterpart to the exhortation which commenced already at ch. lv.—The division propounded by *Ewald*, ii. p. 408, into—(*a*) ch. xl.–xlviii., first attempt to exhaust on all sides the great questions of the time; (*b*) ch. xlix.–lx., where the prophet, at a time not much later, has brought forward the whole truth as to the Servant of Jehovah; (*c*) ch. lxi. 1–lxiii. 6, a postscript, in which the prophet represents himself and his aim with greater precision; (*d*) a later and widely divergent supplement, written after the history had developed itself further, ch. lxiii. 7–lxvi.,—all this stands and falls with the anti-scriptural assumptions of this learned man, in regard to prophecy, and to the genuineness of our book.

Finally, ch. i. contains a prophetic address to his contemporaries, which is to be regarded as an introduction to the entire collection. Besides, the superscriptions occurring in the book (i. 1, ii. 1, xiii. 1, xiv. 28, xv. 1, xvii. 1, xix. 1, xxi. 1, 11, 13, xxii. 1, xxiii. 1, xxxviii. 9) are in harmony with the plan of it as now presented; for they occur only where no connection is to be found—that is, in the sense of constant progress and continual development (5).

(5) The superscription i. 1 is for the whole book, as is proved by the mention of the four kings under whom Isaiah prophesied; comp. Hos. i. 1, Mic. i. 1.—With ch. ii. begins properly the body of prophecies which form one whole; hence the new superscription here. Besides these, superscriptions are regularly found only in the group ch. xiii.–xxiii., because this part of the book contains denunciatory discourses against a number of different nations, which do not develope

themselves according to any internal connection of the thoughts, but are simply placed side by side as being homogeneous. Comp. *Drechsler*, i. p. 37 f., ii. p. 228 f.

§ 66. *The Date of Composition and the Genuineness of ch.* i.–xii.

It is almost universally admitted that, without exception, these chapters are from the pen of Isaiah, containing pieces from the first period of his prophetic ministry; and yet the greatest diversity of opinion prevails in reference to the date of composition of each of them. Ch. i. proceeds neither from the time of Uzziah or Jotham, nor from that of Ahaz, but from the times of Hezekiah, after the invasion of Sennacherib; for this discourse presupposes a point of time in which all that remained of the kingdom of Judah was reduced to the city of Jerusalem, and in which a dead ceremonial service was all that was attained on the part of the people by all the severe visitations which had passed over them. On account of the generality of its tenor, and the nature of its subject-matter, which is characteristic of the entire time or period of Isaiah's active labours in its essential operating forces, it has been prefixed as an introduction to the whole collection (1). Ch. ii.–iv. points to the first times of Jotham's government, as well by its contents, which presuppose a flourishing and powerful condition of the people, yet degenerating into pride through its wealth, and power, and luxury; as also by its dependence on Mic. iv. 1–3 (2). Ch. v. presupposes a similar condition of the people, and proceeds from the same time (3). Ch. vi. is placed by ver. 1 in the year that king Uzziah died, and no valid ground presents itself for a later time of composition (4). The four following discourses, ch. vii.–xii., belong to the first years of Ahaz, and in such a way that the last three are about three-quarters of a year later than the first (ch. vii.); yet probably they were not written down till somewhat later, when a part of the prophetic announcement began to be confirmed (vii. 1), and then were written in uninterrupted succession (5).

(1) So *Drechsler*, i. p. 91 ff. Others place it under Ahaz (*Gesenius*, *Maurer*, *Knobel*, *De Wette*, *Häv.* p. 67), or under Jotham (*Calvin*, *Hendewerk*); but most of the older writers place it in the time of Uzziah, or in the years in which Jotham acted as regent while his father lived. See the full account of the different opinions in *Caspari*,

Beitrr. p. 1 ff. note. He himself seeks to establish this last opinion at great length, understanding vers. 5–9 not of the present condition of Judah, but as a prophecy of coming judgments, (but ?).

(2) Comp. *Hengstb.* Christol. i. p. 481 ff., *Drechsler*, i. p. 174 ff., *Caspari*, p. 234 ff. Others, like *J. D. Michaelis*, *De Wette*, *Hendewerk*, and *Knobel*, place it in the time of Jotham's sole government; on the contrary, *Gesenius*, *Rosenmüller*, *Maurer*, *Movers* (die bibl. Chronik, p. 144 f., 150), *Hitzig*, *Ewald*, *Umbreit*, *Stähelin* (messian. Weissagg., Berlin 1847, p. 43), and others, in the time of Ahaz, especially on account of iii. 12. Comp. against this, *Caspari*, p. 272 ff. Finally, *Kleinert*, p. 364 ff., and *Roorda* in the Orientalia, edd. *Juynboll* etc. i. p. 82, place it in the time of Hezekiah.

(3) The whole body of expositors are agreed that the discourse in ch. v. falls in one and the same time as the preceding one; so we have the views recurring which have been mentioned in Note 2. Comp. *Caspari*, p. 294 ff.; where at the same time there is a refutation at great length of the attempt, made especially by *Hitzig* and *Ewald*, to combine this chapter with ch. ii.–iv. into *one* prophecy. He also shows that each of the two pieces has a fundamental thought peculiar to itself and different from the other: in ch. ii.–iv., "that Israel's present false glory shall be annihilated by a judgment from Jehovah, and the true glory shall be substituted for it;" in ch. v., on the other hand, "that Israel, God's vineyard, shall be given up by Jehovah to desolation, because, instead of good fruit, it has produced only bad fruit."

(4) Perverted and unbiblical representations of the nature of prophecy lie at the foundation of such opinions as *Hitzig's*, who explains the calling of the prophet, as here narrated, to be a fiction, and the prophecy to be a *vaticinium ex eventu* proceeding from the epoch of Sennacherib's invasion; and of such opinions as *Ewald's*, *Credner's* (Joel, p. 74), *Stickel's* (theol. Studien u. Krit. 1840, p. 273 ff.), and *Knobel's*, that the historical basis belongs to the year of Uzziah's death, but that the composition falls either in the beginning of Hezekiah's reign (*Ewald*), or in the first years of Ahaz. Against these views, see *Häv.* p. 68, *Caspari*, p. 332 ff.

(5) Comp. *Häv.* p. 69, *Drechsler*, pp. 422 and 505.—*Gesenius* and *Knobel* place ch. ix. 7–x. 4 at the time when Tiglath-pileser had already humbled Syria and Ephraim, and had [partially] carried them captive; but this does not follow from ix. 9, 10.—The fourth discourse (x. 5–xii. 6) is placed by *Gesenius*, *Maurer*, and *Knobel*, after the taking of Samaria by Shalmaneser; by *Ewald*, in the time preceding Sennacherib's expedition to Egypt, or at that time; by *Häv.*, in the

interval between the sixth and the fourteenth year of Hezekiah. But the two latter opinions find no tenable support in x. 24; while the internal unity of all the discourses from viii. 5 to xii. 6, and the common relation of the whole of them to ch. vii., pronounce against it decidedly, and presuppose the same date of composition. Ch. x. 5, too, attaches itself to what precedes, without any hint whatever of a separation in respect of time.

The *genuineness* of these chapters is so universally acknowledged, that there has been little of approving response to isolated assaults upon individual portions. The affinity in ideas and language which prevails between ch. i.–v. and various passages in Micah, is perfectly explained by the fact that these prophets were contemporaries, and laboured hand in hand. It is just so with the parallels ii. 2–4 and Mic. iv. 1–3. Isaiah has placed an utterance of Micah's at the head of his prophecy, having chosen it to be his starting-point when depicting the true and the false glory of Israel (6).—The historical narrative, vii. 1–16, is indispensable if the prophecy which follows is to be intelligible; and the hymn of thanksgiving, ch. xii., is a suitable continuation, and a wider extension in lyric form, of the thought in xi. 15, 16; and only by means of it is the discourse fully rounded off and brought to a conclusion (7).

(6) The fancy of *Roorda*, *l.c.* p. 80 sqq., that Isa.' i.–v., excepting i. 1 and ii. 1–4, belongs to Micah, has already met with the refutation it deserved from *Häv.* p. 71.—The parallels Isa. ii. 2–4 and Mic. iv. 1–3 are not both taken from an ancient oracle (*Ewald*); nor borrowed from Joel, having fallen out from behind ch. iv. 20 (*Hitzig*, theol. Studien u. Krit. 1829, p. 349 ff., and in his Comm. on Isaiah, pp. 21, 22, against which comp. *Credner*, Joel, p. 72, *Hendewerk*, and *Knobel*); nor a gloss in Isaiah taken from Micah (*Credner*, p. 74, against which see *Hitzig*, Jesaja, p. 22); nor borrowed by Micah from Isaiah (*Beckhaus*, *Umbreit*): but it is the reverse, taken by Isaiah from Micah (*J. D. Michaelis*, *Gesenius*, *Hengstb.* Christol. i. p. 480 ff., *Kleinert*, p. 356 ff., *Hendewerk*, *Drechsler*, i. p. 173 ff., and others).

(7) The objections by *Gesenius* against Isaiah having written vii. 1–16 are refuted by *Kleinert*, p. 480 ff., *Hitzig*, p. 69, and *Häv.* p. 72. The doubts raised by *Koppe*, *Vater* (Commentatt. in Jes. xi., Halæ 1801), and *Rosenmüller* (Scholia, ed. 1) against the genuineness of xi. and xii., have been long ago dissipated by *Beckhaus* (üb. die Integrität der prophet. Schriften des Alten Bundes, Halle 1796

p. 77 ff.) and *Gesenius*, Comm. p. 389 ff. The later assault of *Ewald* (i. p. 281) upon the genuineness of ch. xii. is founded entirely upon the thoroughly vague and exaggerated assertion, "Words, images, turns, and indeed the whole contents and spirit, are not those of Isaiah;" and it overlooks both the lyrical character of this piece, and that genuine expression of Isaiah, "The Holy One of Israel" (xii. 6). Comp. against this, *Umbreit*, i. p. 117, and *Häv. ibid.*

§ 67. *Genuineness of ch.* xiii.–xxvii.

These chapters are shown to be genuine, and integral portions of the book of Isaiah, not only by their position amid the collection of his prophecies (1), but also and even more by the homogeneousness of the collective contents of the prophetic discourses in this and the preceding division of our book, the very series of thoughts which lay at the foundation of the first being resumed and carried out further in the second (2); again, by the real connection of the two groups, which are mutually supplementary,—on the one hand, the pieces in this group presupposing the discourses in the first group, being rooted in them, and receiving their full meaning from them, and, on the other hand, the discourses in the first group containing a multitude of hints, which require a further expansion that is not given to them until we reach these second discourses (3); further, by the harmonious arrangement and structure of the discourses in the two divisions, whether considered in general or in particular (4); and, finally, by the resemblance to the diction and language which characterize Isaiah (5).

(1) The opinion prevalent amongst the impugners of the genuineness of our book, that all sorts of anonymous and "loose leaves of the Babylonian literature, left without historical references," had slipped unobserved into the collection of Isaiah's genuine pieces (*Ew.* i. pp. 58, 59), is a pure fiction.

(2) Comp. *Drechsler*, ii. pp. 2–4. The principal thoughts in ch. viii.–xii., discourses which proceed from ch. vii. as their source, are these: the catastrophe by which insolent Assyria, the worldly power in opposition to God, shall be overtaken; and the dawning revelation of Messiah's kingdom, when the resisting worldly system has been set aside (comp. viii. 6–10, ix. 1–6, x. 5–34, and xi. xii.). The former of these is such a large constituent element of the discourses ch. xiii.–xxiii., as the latter is of ch. xxiv.–xxvii., that the whole of these

chapters are to be regarded as expanding and carrying out those fundamental ideas. Ch. xiii. 1–xiv. 27 is merely an amplification and continuation of ch. x. 5–34, ch. xiv. 1, 2, at the same time having its roots in xi. 10–16. Ch. xiv. 28–32 merely expands and carries out xi. 14*a*; as ch. xv. xvi. attaches itself to xi. 14*c*, and carries out the judgment on Moab still further. Ch. xvii. and xviii. are partly (as xvii. 12–14, xviii. 4–6) a simple resumption of x. 5–34, partly (as xvii. 1–11) a side-piece expanding it. Ch. xix. has its point of attachment to xi. 11, 15, 16; as ch. xviii. and xx. have in xi. 11; and as xxi. 11, 12 have in xi. 14, where xxi. 13–17 has also one (in בְּנֵי קֵדָר). On the other hand, the second fundamental idea, on which all these chapters only lightly touch, is developed in ch. xxiv.–xxvii., which form the indispensable counterpart to ch. xiii.–xxiii. In addition, compare also the corresponding thoughts: "Israel shall be reduced to a mere remnant (x. 21, 22, xvii. 4–6, xxiv. 1–13); this remnant shall return, and turn away from all false supports, and to the only true support (x. 20, 21, xvii. 7, 8, xx. 5, 6; comp. xxvii. 9). The triumphant shout of deliverance shall break forth in the very midst of the condition of deepest misery and ruin (ix. 1, xi. 1, xxiv. 14); the yoke shall be broken (ix. 3, x. 27, xiv. 25), the oppressor annihilated (x. 16–19, 33, 34, xiv. 25, xvi. 4, xvii. 12–14, xviii. 4–6, xxv. 10–12, xxvi. 11, 14, xxvii. 10, 11, 12), Israel gathered home from the dispersion (xi. 11, 12, 15, 16, xiv. 1, xxvii. 13)," etc.

(3) This real connection existing between the two groups is particularly manifested in these ways. On the one hand, certain series of ideas return only here and there in single fragments, and bear the character of incidental reminiscences of ideas which are already familiar, and which presuppose earlier developments thoroughly carried out: for instance, the Messianic elements, xiv. 1, 2, 29, 30, xvi. 1, 4, 5, xviii. 7, xix. 16–24, xxiii. 15–18, which would not be fully intelligible but for viii. 5–ix. 6, and x. 5–xii. 6; the rhapsodic mention made of Assyria, xiv. 24–27, xvii. 12–14, xviii. 4–6, xix. 23–25, xxvii. 13, which do not admit of explanation, except as allusions to the extended discourses in viii. 6–10, ix. 3, 4, and x. 5–34. Finally, the entire long discourse, ch. xxiv.–xxvii., becomes intelligible only in connection with ch. xiii.–xxiii. On the other hand, the discourses, ch. vii.–xii., contain not a few introductory statements and germs of thoughts, which require and demand a fuller expansion and explication, such as is given only in ch. xiii.–xxvii.: thus in vii. 7–9, 15, 16, in reference to Ephraim and Syria; in reference to Egypt, vii. 18, 19; in reference to Assyria itself, in so far as the discourse, viii. 7, 8, advances by a generalization from the single Assyrian people to the

multitudes of nations, viii. 9, 10, and announces to all nations the annihilation of their plans against the theocracy; with which, further, the enumeration in xi. 11 and the exemplifying specification in xi. 14–16 hang together; comp. *Drechsler*, pp. 4–8.

(4) Viewing it as a whole, this harmony is manifested in the arrangement and consecution of the individual pieces in this division. Assyria occupies the first place, only in ch. xiii. and xiv. the message is expanded into a prophecy against Babylon, as coming in its place; moreover, from Babylon the discourse returns back at its close to Assyria, xiv. 24–27. In xvii. 12–xviii. 7, Assyria is combined with Ephraim and Syria: this is in harmony with ch. vii.–xii., where Assyria everywhere occupies the foreground, being the principal power. Further, the pieces in ch. xix.–xxiii. follow one another essentially in quite the same order as the nations are enumerated in xi. 11: ch. xix. and xx. correspond to "Egypt, Pathros, and Cush," there; in place of "Elam" there, comes Babylon, ch. xxi. 1–10; "Shinar and Hamath" there correspond to the following oracle, xxi. 11–17; and the last named there, "the islands of the sea," are represented in ch. xxiii. by Tyre, the island-city in the sea, vers. 2, 6. With reference to the similar structure of the various discourses, comp. especially the passages viii. 6–10, x. 28–34, xvii. 12–14, xviii. 4–6, and xxiv. 1–15, with the treatment of them at greater length in *Drechsler*, pp. 10, 11.

(5) See the proofs of this in the following notes: 12, 15, 21, 25, 28, and 34.

Yet none the less has a considerable portion of these prophecies been pronounced not to belong to the prophet Isaiah, their genuineness having been denied.

I. The prophecies against Babylon, ch. xiii. 1–xiv. 23, and xxi. 1–10; which are attributed to an unnamed prophet in the last times of the exile (6). This assertion, however, not only betrays entire want of insight into the organic connection of these pieces with the remaining prophecies of Isaiah (comp. Notes 2–4),—it also rests on an anti-scriptural representation of the character of biblical prophecy, according to which every supernatural prediction of occurrences that lie beyond the political horizon of the historical present, is assumed *à priori* to be impossible, without entering more closely or deeply into the prophecy itself, or into the historical points of attachment that are given in the relations of the prophet's own time, and which form the natural sub-

stratum for the supernatural revelation (7). Whilst in the first prophecy against Babylon, ch. xiii. xiv., its connection with Assyria at the close of the discourse, xiv. 24–27, is enough to conduct us to the times of Isaiah (8): still more particularly, the genuineness of both prophecies follows from their superscriptions (9); from the fact which cannot be put aside by denials, that both have been used by several subsequent prophets, some of them earlier than the exile (10); and, finally, by no small number of ideas which are genuinely Isaiah's (11), as also similar linguistic peculiarities (12). In opposition to all this, there is said to occur in these prophecies a difference of representations and of linguistic usage; but this stands out as an utterly unfounded allegation, when we go more closely into the discussion (13).

(6) Earlier by *Rosenmüller*, *Justi* (vermischte Abhandll. i. p. 359, ii. p. 66), *Paulus*, *Eichhorn*, and *Bertholdt;* against whom *J. D. Michaelis*, *Hensler*, *Uhland* (vatic. Jes. c. xiii. prophetæ Jes. vindica. Tubingæ 1798), *Beckhaus*, *Jahn*, and *Dereser* defended the genuineness: later by *Gesenius*, *Hitzig*, *De Wette*, *Ewald*, *Hendewerk*, *Knobel*, *Umbreit*, *Herzfeld*, Geschichte d. Volks Israel, Braunschweig 1847, i. p. 290 ff., and others [including *Bleek*]; combated by *P. Schleyer* (Würdigung der Einwürfe gegen die Alttestamentl. Weissagg. an d. Orakel üb. d. Untergang Babels, c. xiii.–xiv. 23, Rottenb. 1835) rather feebly; much more thoroughly by *Häv.* Einl. ii. 2, p. 78 ff., and Symbolæ ad defend. authentiam vatic. Jesaiæ xiii.–xiv. 23, Regiomonte 1842. Further, compare *Fr. Hosse*, "das Verhältniss von Babel zu Assur bei Jesaja," in the deutsch. Zeitschrift f. Christl. Wissenschaft, 1857, No. 57 f.

(7) The assertion is placed in the foreground of their argumentation by our opponents, that the last period of the exile, when the Medes were already advancing upon Babylon and threatening ruin to the Chaldean empire, while the Jews were expecting speedy deliverance and return to their own country, is the present time of the prophet, the position which he occupies as he prophesies (*Hitzig*, p. 153, *Gesenius*, *Ewald*, and others). Combining this with the conclusion drawn from it, "that in this way we are carried off entirely from the age of Isaiah," it at once becomes manifest enough that they acknowledge no supernatural prophecy transcending the anticipations of human sharpsightedness. But this uncritical prejudice is at once contradicted by the universal character of our prophecy, which proves that it rests, as to its deeper foundation, not nearly so much upon political knowledge of external circumstances, as upon clear penetra-

tion into the internal attitude of Babylon towards the kingdom of God. The importance of Babylon was this, that it was the central position of heathenism; and it had this significance, not so much "as the older and more famous capital, and as one of the two centres of the Assyrian kingdom," as rather because it was the city which in the remotest antiquity had exalted itself to be the centre for humanity estranged from God, from which the human race went forth divided into races speaking various languages. This attitude of Babylon to the theocracy must have readily suggested the thought that it was the city in which Israel was to be exiled and placed in subjection to the heathen (*Hofmann*, Weissagung u. Erfüllung, i. p. 245). On the ground of this significance of Babylon, the Spirit of the Lord revealed to the prophet *Micah*, iv. 9 ff., that Israel should be carried away to Babylon, and there should be redeemed from the hand of their enemies; and to the prophet *Isaiah*, that not Assyria but Babylon should fully execute the judgment upon Judah, but that it should then be cast down from its high position, while the people of God should be redeemed from its power. When Micah had already prophesied that Israel should be carried away to Babylon, and should there be also redeemed, Isaiah could also transport himself in spirit to the time in which Babylon attained to the zenith of its power, and announce its ruin to Israel, without running off the grooves of the present in this prophecy. For not only the prophecy in Mic. iv. 9 ff. (which forms the theme of Isa. xiii. and xiv., just as much as Mic. iv. 1 ff. forms the theme of Isa. ii. 1 ff.; see *Häv.* p. 83), but also the way and manner in which Isaiah, at a later time, announced to Hezekiah that all the treasures of his house should be carried to Babylon, ch. xxxix., place the truth of the proposition beyond all doubt, "erat jam vulgatum per ecclesiam populi Dei, imminere hoc fatum genti, ut per Babylonios suo tempore abducatur e terra sua in triste exilium, cum eversa republica et destructo templo" (*Vitringa*, Comm. i. p. 486).—Moreover, the historical relations of Babylon at that time presented a favourable historical point of attachment for our prophecy; namely this, that although Babylon was at that time still subject to the Assyrian government, yet already there did exist a Chaldean power in Babylon, according to Isa. xxiii. 13, which necessarily attracted the attention of the prophet. Also the coming of the Babylonian ambassadors to Jerusalem (Isa. xxxix.) is sufficient to show how the kings of Babylon discerned an opportunity for making themselves independent in every weakening of the Assyrian power. —Even the mention made of the Medes (Isa. xiii. 17) is in no way unfavourable to Isaiah's authorship; since, not to speak of their

character as renowned in war, they had had partially independent kings at a still earlier time, although they belonged to the Assyrian empire under Shalmaneser, so that the exiled Israelites could be removed to the cities of Media (2 Kings xvii. 6, xviii. 11). If Isaiah already mentioned Kir and Elam, ch. xxii. 6, then he could also threaten with the Medes; comp. *Häv.* p. 79 ff. [In fact his threatening vengeance on Babylon at the hand of the *Medes*, without naming the Persians, is so far a presumption that the writer could not have been a contemporary of Cyrus.]

(8) Not only is the genuineness of xiv. 24–27 free from all doubt, there is just as little doubt of the close connection between this concluding strophe and the preceding utterance against Babylon. Comp. *Häv.* Symbolæ, p. 11 sqq., and *Delitzsch* on *Drechsler*, iii. p. 401. The expression in ver. 24, "Jehovah of hosts hath sworn," is a resumption of "saith Jehovah of hosts," in ver. 23; and the conclusion, "This is the purpose that is purposed upon the whole earth, and this is the hand that is stretched out upon all the nations," etc. (vers. 26–7), points back to the commencement, where the judgment on Babylon is depicted in its universality as affecting all nations (xiii. 4, 5); so that *Ewald* himself has to confess (i. p. 58) that "the little genuine piece by Isaiah about Assyria, which stands in the closest possible connection with the utterance against Babylon (xiv. 24–27), has hovered like a theme in front of the later (?) piece." Add to this, that in Jeremiah's oracle against Babylon, in which he has made great use of our prophecy, he has taken notice of this combination of Assyria with Babylon (l. 17, 18); and with a correct knowledge of the close connection of the two, he says, "Behold, I will punish the king of Babylon and his land, as I have punished the king of Assyria." For the principal significance of this concluding strophe of our prophecy consists in this, "that by means of it, the execution upon Assyria, to be expected within a comparatively short space of time, is also given as a pledge of the sufficient fulfilment of xiii. 1–xiv. 23 at a point of time much more remote. In this respect, Jer. l. 17, 18 is almost to be regarded as an authentic interpretation of the aim of xiv. 24–27" (*Drechsler*, p. 43). On the contrary, if these verses are torn away from the preceding prophecy, then they remain inexplicable; since the assumption that they are a fragment of a greater prophecy against Assyria, which belonged to Isaiah (*Koppe*, *Rosenmüller*, *Gesenius*, *Hendewerk*, *Ewald*, and others), is wrecked upon the inability to find a suitable position in which to place it; and the hypothesis of *Hitzig* and *Umbreit*, that they formed a little independent prophecy, is refuted, not only by the absence of

any superscription, but also by the very contents of the verses, since no one is addressed, and the whole is fundamentally only a formula of asseveration; comp. *Häv.* pp. 98–9.

(9) The rejection of the superscriptions of both oracles as spurious is a stretch of critical power. If a later editor had been the first to attach the superscriptions, he would have provided *all* the prophecies with these, and not have confined himself to isolated cases. Add to this, that we cannot doubt the genuineness of many superscriptions, though it were only for this reason, their most intimate connection with the prophecies, as vi. 1, xiv. 28, and xx. 1, 2, comp. with vii. 1 ff. The same is true of xiii. 1, where the prophet speaks of Babylon in vers. 2–18, without having named it; so that, without the superscription, the whole of the first part of the prophecy would suffer from great obscurity. Finally, the superscription in xxi. 1 contains a symbolical designation of the land, which could proceed only from the author himself, and not from an ordinary editor, and which is shown to be in Isaiah's style by the analogy of similar symbolic designations, xxi. 11, xxii. 1; whilst Isaiah also uses symbolic significant names elsewhere, comp. xxix. 1, xxii. 5, vii. 3, 14, viii. 1. See *Häv.* Symbolæ, p. 5 sqq., and Einl. pp. 96 ff. 117 ff.; *Delitzsch* on *Drechsler*, iii. p. 400.

(10) While in Isa. xiii. and xiv. notice is taken and use is made only of Joel and Amos among older prophets, comp. xiii. 3 with Joel ii. 11; xiii. 6 with Joel i. 15; xiii. 8 with Joel ii. 6; xiii. 10 with Joel ii. 10 and iii. 4 [Hebrew]; xiii. 13 with Joel iv. 15, 16; xiii. 19 with Amos iv. 11: on the other hand, there are many allusions and references to these chapters in the later prophets. Thus, in Habakkuk, comp. the "taunting proverb," ii. 6 ff. with Isa. xiv. 4 ff.; besides ii. 9 with Isa. xiii. 9, 11, xiv. 13 ff.: in Zephaniah, i. 7 (הַקְדִּישׁ קְרֻאָיו) and iii. 11 (עֲלִילֹתֶיךָ גַּאוָתֶךָ) with Isa. xiii. 3; ii. 13–15 with Isa. xiii. 20–22: in Ezekiel, comp., for instance, vii. 17 and xxi. 12 with Isa. xiii. 7; xxi. 3 with Isa. xiii. 8; xxxii. 12 ff. with Isa. xiv. 4: and very particularly in Jeremiah, where ch. l. li. take up anew our prophecy against Babylon as a whole, and work it up so that almost every individual verse reappears there. Comp. *Küper*, Jerem. p. 124 sqq.; *Häv.* Symbolæ, p. xxxi. sqq., and Einl. p. 101 ff.; *Caspari* in *Rudelbach* and *Guericke's* Zeitschrift, 1843, ii. p. 66 ff.; and *Drechsler*, pp. 43–4. —Also many echoes, reminiscences, and imitations of Isa. xxi. 1–10 are found in the later prophets: comp. Nah. ii. 11*b* with xxi. 3 (as also Nah. ii. 11*a* with xxii. 5, xxiv. 1); the designation of the Chaldeans as גּוֹיִם, Hab. i. 13, taken from Isa. xxi. 2; further, Hab. ii. 1 with xxi. 6, 8 (as also Hab. ii. 2 with Isa. viii. 1, xxx. 8); and

especially Jer. li. 8 with Isa. xxi. 9; Jer. l. 33, 34 with Isa. xxi. 10; Jer. li. 33 with Isa. xxi. 10; Jer. l. 2, 38, li. 8, 47, 52, taking up Isa. xxi. 9 anew. Comp. *Küper*, p. 127 sq.; *Häv.* Einl. pp. 121–2; *Drechsler*, p. 117.

(11) The following representations are peculiar to Isaiah's circle of ideas: an ensign lifted up on the part of God to summon distant nations, xiii. 2, comp. v. 26, xi. 10, 12, xviii. 3, xlix. 22, lxii. 10; shaking or waving the hand, xiii. 2, comp. x. 32, xi. 15, xix. 16, xlix. 22; the comparison with Sodom and Gomorrah, xiii. 19, comp. i. 7, 9, iii. 9; the interweaving of songs, xiv. 4 ff., comp. v. 1 ff., xii. [xxiii. 15, 16]; the image of the staff or rod, xiv. 5, 6, comp. x. 24, ix. 3; the cutting down the cedars of Lebanon, xiv. 8, comp. xxxvii. 24 [x. 19, 34?]; the prosopopœia, "the fir-trees rejoice at thee," etc., xiv. 8, comp. xliv. 23, lv. 12; the descent of the sounding viols, etc., into Sheol, xiv. 11, comp. v. 14 with ver. 12; further, the turn in xxi. 6, quite like viii. 11 (as *Gesenius* himself acknowledges); the designation of the prophets as watchmen, xxi. 8, comp. xxi. 11, 12, lii. 8, lvi. 10; the harmony of xxi. 7, 9 with xxii. 6, 7. Add to all this the frequent coincidences of xxi. 1–10 and of xiii. and xiv.: thus—

xxi. 1*b*; 2*b*; 3, 4; 10.
xiii. 5; 2, 3, 17*a*; 6, 8; xiv. 1, 2.

—See *Drechsler*, p. 116.

(12) Linguistic peculiarities of Isaiah are found in xiii. 5, אֶרֶץ מֶרְחָק, comp. xlvi. 11, and מִקְצֵה הַשָּׁמַיִם with מִקְצֵה הָאָרֶץ, v. 26; the combination of צְבִי, תִּפְאָרֶת, and גְּאוֹן, xiii. 19, comp. iv. 2, xxviii. 1, 4, 5; שְׂעִירִים, xiii. 21 and xxxiv. 14; the explanation of the symbolical expression by another without any figure, xiv. 9, 13, 14, comp. i. 5, 6, 7, and on these see *Kleinert*, pp. 283–4; the form מֶרְדָּךְ, xiv. 6 and viii. 8, 23; נֵצֶר, xiv. 19 and xi. 1; סָרָה, xiv. 6, comp. i. 5, xxxi. 6; עָלַיִן, xiii. 3 and xxii. 2; זֶרַע מְרֵעִים, xiv. 20, as i. 4; and others. Besides, in ch. xxi. 2, the combination of שָׁדַד and בָּגַד as in xxxiii. 1, also xxiv. 16; חָזוּת for חָזוֹן, xxi. 2, and xxix. 11, comp. xxviii. 18.

(13) According to *Hitzig*, p. 154, the following representations are foreign to Isaiah:—"In xiv. 2, that the heathen are at some future time to be incorporated with the people of God, as servants to the Jews; whereas there is no thought of any such inequality of privileges in ii. 1 ff." But xiv. 1 also speaks of a voluntary cleaving of the strangers to the theocracy, in harmony with ii. 1 ff. The subjection of the heathen to the people of God is taken from Lev. xxv. 44, etc., and it is expressed also in Isa. xi. 14; comp. xlix. 22, 23, lx. 8 ff., lxi. 5, 6. "According to Isa. xiii. 4, 5, Jehovah musters a foreign host

for battle, and leads it on; on the contrary, v. 26 and vii. 18 make Jehovah allure the foreign warriors." But in the one case, the host of war is already present; in the other, it has first to be brought in, and this different thought demands also a different image. That Isaiah nowhere names the mountain of the gods, except in xiv. 13, proves nothing, since there is no reason for deciding that this may not be an idea of the prophet's. The personification of Sheol, xiv. 9, is found also in v. 14 and xxxviii. 18, as in Ps. vi. 6. Finally, the argument from the affinity between the representations in these prophecies and those in Isa. xl.–lxvi., simply moves in a vicious circle. The instances of alleged later *usus loquendi* are still feebler. הִשְׁנִיחַ, xiv. 16, "earlier it is only poetical;" but xiv. 4 ff. is also a poetical hymn. עָנָה, "to begin to speak," xiv. 10, xxi. 9: no, here also it is nothing else than "to answer," as often similarly in Job. פָּתַח, "to loosen, to let go; earlier, to open:" but this meaning occurs already in *Kal* in Ps. xxxvii. 14, and in *Piel* in Gen. xxiv. 32. "The use of נָדִיב and מוֹשֵׁל (xiii. 2, xiv. 5) in the bad sense of *tyrant:*" this is valueless, such a meaning being a mere fancy. Finally, the origination, in an age later than Isaiah's, of חַלְחָלָה and פַּלָּצוּת, xxi. 3, 4, remains still to be proved. Comp. *Häv.* pp. 94–5 and 120; and compare his Symbolæ, p. 20 sq., in reference to the glosses which *Hitzig* has espied in ch. xiii. and xiv.

II. The prophecy against Moab, ch. xv. xvi., is said to have been uttered by a more ancient prophet, and to have been repeated and applied to his own time by Isaiah, who furnished it with an epilogue, ch. xvi. 13, 14 (14). But there is no proof of this, either from the epilogue, or from "the obvious difference of language and drapery." The stamp of Isaiah's genuine style cannot be mistaken in the closing words (15); but from this it does not follow that the preceding prophecy was already uttered at some time long before (16). And the alleged difference of language and drapery is reduced to a certain antique colouring in the representation; especially that the discourse progresses in short clauses, and that these are connected somewhat monotonously by the particles כִּי and עַל־כֵּן: the explanation of which is, that Isaiah goes back to the prophecies in the Pentateuch against Moab (Num. xxi. 27 ff. and xxiv. 17), whose fulfilment he announces, and in doing so he attaches himself to the very form of those old prophecies. Thus his prophecy stands in the relation to the ancient songs in Num. xxi., that Isa. xii. stands in to Exod. xv. (17). Not

only is this circumstance decisive in favour of the composition by Isaiah, that there is no analogous case of the interpolation of so long a prophecy by a strange hand, while anything executed by the prophet himself is wholly awanting (18);—there are, besides, the unmistakeable connection of this piece with the preceding prophecy against Philistia (19), its dramatic character (20), and its affinities in representation and language (21).

(14) Whereas *Koppe*, *Augusti*, *Bertholdt* (Einl. p. 1398), and others attributed this prophecy to Jeremiah (against which, see *Beckhaus*, p. 99 ff., *V. Cölln*, spicil. observatt. ad Zephaniæ vatic. p. 20 sq., and *Gesenius*, Comm. i. p. 510 f.), *Gesenius*, p. 507, *Ewald*, *Umbreit*, *Maurer*, and *Knobel* hold that it is the prophecy of an older unknown prophet, whom *Hitzig* thinks he has discovered in the person of Jonah, the son of Amittai. Comp. *Hitzig*, Isa. p. 180 ff., and his "des Propheten Jonas Orakel über Moab," Heidelberg 1830. See the refutation of this groundless hypothesis in *Credner* (theol. Studien u. Krit. 1833, p. 780; *Hendewerk*, pp. 386–7; and *Häv.* p. 108 ff.). [It is also pronounced quite untenable by *Bleek*, p. 569, who gives 1831 as the date of the work of *Hitzig*. His own opinion, p. 460, is, that most probably the body of the prophecy was from Isaiah's pen, perhaps from that of a contemporary; and that the epilogue was considerably later, perhaps about the time of the Babylonish captivity.]

(15) Comp. the כִּשְׁנֵי שָׂכִיר, xvi. 14, with xxi. 16; מְעַט מִזְעָר, *ib.*, with x. 25, xxix. 17; נִקְלָה כָבוֹד, *ib.*, with iii. 5.

(16) "The epilogue does not expressly say that another than Isaiah had composed the oracle at an earlier time,"—so says *Hitzig* rightly, Jesai. p. 179; and "מֵאָז, ch. xvi. 13, can signify the nearest past, 2 Sam. xv. 34, Hos. ii. 9" [where it is אָז alone] (p. 198). But xvi. 13 does not refer necessarily and certainly to the preceding oracle, as if designating it as long ago revealed, and now taken up anew; but "docet, rem quam hæc prophetia prænuntiat non esse novam, sed dudum sibi aliisve prophetis revelatam" (*Vitringa*, i. p. 646).

(17) "The utterance in Isa. xv. 1–xvi. 12 is nothing else than a carrying out to its conclusion of that which in the germ had been already given in the Pentateuch, that basis of the Prophetic Word in general. The entire future of the people of Israel, as well as of the people of Moab, had been fixed already by those things which occurred between Balak and Balaam; in particular, compare Num. xxiv. 17. To this add things of a later time which we have: of the age of David, Ps. lx. 10, lxxxiii. 7 [the latter rather of the age of

Jehoshaphat]; and of the period of the prophets preceding our prophet, [2 Kings iii. 7 ff.,] Amos ii. 1 ff." (*Drechsler*, p. 67). And thus Jeremiah himself, while making use of our prophecy, goes back upon the original word of prophecy; comp. Jer. xlviii. 45, 46 with Num. xxi. 28, 39. How Isaiah goes back in individual instances upon that passage of the Pentateuch, appears distinctly from the name בְּאֵר אֵלִים, xv. 8, which can be explained only from Num. xxi. 16–18; from his mentioning Heshbon, xv. 4, comp. Num. xxi. 26 ff.; from עָר מוֹאָב, xv. 1, comp. Num. xxi. 28; and other such. Comp. *Häv.* p. 111 f.

(18) Comp. *Häv.* p. 110. *Gesenius*, p. 509, appeals to the assumption into ii. 2–4 of Mic. iv. 1 ff. But this offers no suitable analogy, since here only some few verses of another man's prophecy are made the starting-point of a longer prophecy.

(19) This connection shows itself particularly in the similar position of both nations, and their relation to the theocracy: comp. xiv. 29, 32 with xvi. 1 ff.; xiv. 30 with xv. 9; xiv. 31 with xvi. 7, xv. 2 ff. Comp. *Hendewerk*, i. p. 385 ff.

(20) Comp. the collection of examples in *Kleinert*, pp. 286–7, of Isaiah's dramatic representations, in which we have often to conjecture from the context who the persons are that speak.

(21) The enumeration or accumulation of geographical names and allusions to names, with the frequently recurring כִּי and עַל־כֵּן, which are found in our prophecy, and at which offence is taken, are to be explained simply from the induction which is carried on through the whole of it (*Drechsler*, p. 57)—a figure of speech which Isaiah delights to employ, comp. ii. 12 ff., iii. 18 ff., x. 28 ff. (*Drechsler*, p. 52); this last example being also full of allusions to names. Further, the declaration of his sympathy, xv. 5, xvi. 11, is also found in xxii. 4; comp. xxviii. 1 ff. Affinity in expression and in language, in individual instances, appears in xvi. 1 (הַר בַּת־צִיּוֹן), like x. 32; הָלַם, metaphorically, "to intoxicate," xvi. 8, comp. xxviii. 1. The introduction, xv. 1, bears a resemblance to xxiii. 1; and in strophe xvi. 1–6, *Ewald* himself believes that he many a time feels the breath of the genuine atmosphere of Isaiah; comp. especially xvi. 4 with xxix. 20, and xvi. 5 with ix. 6.

III. The integrity of the prophecy against Egypt (ch. xix.) is assailed, the second part of it (vers. 16–25) being alleged to be a very late interpolation (22). But the doubts as to its genuineness proceed from an entirely unfounded interpretation of single verses, and from arbitrary suppositions (23); and they are refuted by the close con-

nection of the two parts (24), and by the genuine stamp of Isaiah's ideas and language upon these verses (25).

(22) Following *Koppe* and *Eichhorn*, whose extremely weak reasons have been refuted by *Beckhaus*, p. 108 ff., *Gesenius*, p. 639 f., has given utterance to some unimportant doubts as to whether vers. 18–20 proceed from Isaiah; then *Hitzig*, p. 218 ff., has explained the entire section, vers. 16–25, as being an interpolated addition of the priest Onias, who built the temple at Leontopolis, intended to justify what he had done; and this notion is approved by *Zunz*, die gottesdienstl. Vorträge d. Jud. p. 119. On the contrary, the genuineness is defended by *Rosenmüller*, *Hendewerk* (i. p. 422 ff.), *Ewald* (i. p. 301 ff.), *Umbreit*, *Knobel*, *Caspari* in *Rudelbach* and *Guericke's* Zeitschrift, 1841 (iii. pp. 1–37), *Häv.* (p. 112 ff.), *Drechsler* (p. 89 f.), [and *Bleek* (p. 460), who reckons it one of the latest of Isaiah's productions, after Assyria had been weakened; on which last view observe a remark by *Keil* in Note 25.]

(23) *Hitzig* finds—(*a*) contradictions between the first and the second half of the chapter: "Vers. 16 and 17 make Jehovah, as the particular God of the Jews, terrible to the Egyptians; on the contrary, in vers. 1–15, He is governor of the world." But this He appears plainly enough to be in ver. 25 also, and He never appears as the particular God of the Jews; and the whole difference consists in this, that vers. 1–15 make an abstraction from the relations of Egypt to the theocracy, while vers. 16–25 announce these relations in their future form. Again, the threatenings of destruction on Egypt in the first half, and the benevolent intentions expressed in the second, are to be explained simply in this way: that the first half treats of the judgment on Egypt, and the second half treats of its salutary results; and consequently the judgment is supposed to be over, when ver. 18 uses a name involving an amphibolia, עִיר הַהֶרֶס. Finally, the first section has indeed a sufficient conclusion of its own, and the individual pieces in the second all commence in a peculiar manner; but this only proves that the announcement of judgment ends at ver. 15, and that the second part is distributed into five paragraphs, which are marked by the same introductory formula.—(*b*) The assertion that the contents of the second part stand in contradiction with the relations of Isaiah's time, and with his individuality, ignores the Messianic character of the prophecy, perverts it into confined anticipations in accordance with the political horizon at the date of composition, and drags into ver. 18 ff. arbitrary predictions of the temple at Leontopolis; whereas there is no allusion in ver. 18 to the Heliopolitan nome, nor

in ver. 20 to that temple: nor can what is said of the relation of Assyria to Egypt in vers. 23–25 be made to refer to Syria and its later relations to Egypt and Judea. Against all this, comp. *Caspari, ibid.* p. 15 ff., *Häv.* p. 113 f.

(24) The second half refers to the first half throughout: vers. 16 and 17 point back to ver. 1; Egypt's fear of the land of Judea, mentioned here, is the fruit and consequence of the experience acquired, vers. 1–15; vers. 19 and 20 form a beautiful antithesis to vers. 3, 4; ver. 17 looks back on ver. 12. Comp. *Drechsler* on these verses. Also the second part stands in beautiful internal connection; the five paragraphs depict the gradually developing salvation which is to make Egypt flourish. Comp. *Caspari, ibid.* p. 10 ff., *Drechsler*, p. 97 ff.

(25) The picture of the Messianic time, vers. 16 and 23, is genuinely Isaiah's; comp. xi. 15, 16. The announcement of Egypt's salvation forms a beautiful accompaniment to the utterance as to Ethiopia, xviii. 7 (comp. xlv. 14). The mention of Egypt and Assyria, vers. 23–25, can be explained only from the relations of Isaiah's time, in which these two opposite and naturally hostile poles represent the collective worldly power, which at the time stands in hostile opposition to the kingdom of God, yet shall one day turn to the Lord. *Ewald*, p. 302, asserts erroneously that the appearance of Assyria here is quite different from that in earlier pieces, as of a power already humbled, and consequently that the prophecy dates from the later age of the prophet; against this, comp. *Häv.* p. 116.— In reference to the language, comp. the frequent occurrence of Isaiah's especial peculiarities, בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא, vers. 16, 18 ff., with iv. 1, 2, vii. 18, 20, 21, 23, etc.; תְּנוּפָה, ver. 16, again only xxx. 32, yet comp. x. 32, xi. 15; יָעַץ עֵצָה עַל, ver. 17, with ver. 12, xiv. 26, xxiii. 8, 9 [not precisely the same], etc.; אֲשֶׁר לְ, ver. 18, occurring only in Isa. iv. 3, xxxii. 5, lxi. 6, lxii. 4, etc. Comp. *Casp. ibid.* p. 2 ff.

IV. The prophecy as to Tyre (ch. xxiii.) is denied to Isaiah, on account of the mention of the Chaldeans (ver. 13), the reference to Nebuchadnezzar's siege, and the alleged later style; besides, its integrity is assailed, and vers. 15–18 are declared to be a later addition (26). But the reasons for both assertions are extremely weak. The mention of the Chaldeans as a people who should shortly rise to power, agrees perfectly with the time of Isaiah (27). The reference of the prophecy to the Chaldean siege is available against the genuineness, only if we submit to a critical prejudice which every

true prophecy contradicts; and the critical objections to the style and language are partly exaggerated, partly matters of subjective taste, which can decide nothing in criticism (28). Finally, the integrity of vers. 15–18 is thoroughly justified, not only by their intimate organic connection with the first part of the prophecy, but also by the analogy between the announcement of salvation contained in these verses and similar announcements in ch. xviii. and xix.; as also by their many other genuine peculiarities of Isaiah (29).

(26) It was pronounced not to be genuine by *Eichhorn*, *Rosenmüller*, *Movers* in the theol. Quartalschrift, 1837, p. 506 ff., who attributed it to Jeremiah, [*Bleek*, pp. 462–3, follows *Movers*, attributing it to about the fourth year of Jehoiakim; but it is also noted there that *Movers* himself, Phön. ii. 1, p. 396, Anm. 36, came to think that essentially it was from Isaiah's pen, though wrought up probably by Jeremiah], *Hitzig*, p. 272 ff., *Ewald*, i. p. 238, who holds that the author was a younger contemporary, and a disciple of Isaiah. On the contrary, *Gesenius*, p. 717, and *De Wette*, pronounce the reasons alleged against the genuineness inconclusive.—The integrity of vers. 15–18 has been assailed by *Eichhorn* (against whom comp. *Gesenius*, p. 753); *J. Olshausen*, Emendationen zum Alt. Test. p. 23; and *Ewald*, pp. 239, 242. Comp. against this, *Häv.* pp. 126–7, and *Drechsler*, *in loco*.

(27) The view adopted by *Grotius*, *Gesenius*, and *Umbreit*, that the Chaldeans are named (ver. 13) merely as auxiliaries of the Assyrians, and that the prophecy refers to the siege of Tyre by Shalmaneser, is entirely to be rejected: for the phrase עַם לֹא הָיָה points to the independent power of the Chaldeans; and the reference of the prophecy to the Chaldean siege is demanded by Ezekiel (who in ch. xxvi. takes up anew our prophecy as a whole, and refers it to the Chaldeans), as well as by its own contents. Comp. *Häv.* p. 125, *Drechsler*, pp. 163–4.—*Ewald's* change of Chaldeans into Canaanites requires no refutation.

(28) It is an exaggeration when *Hitzig* asserts, "That the author is not master of his style, that his bearing is defective, that he staggers from one conception and one number into another, in an unheard-of manner." On the contrary, *Umbreit* says, "Lame and feeble verses we do not find at all; but they sound to us firm and strong." *Ewald*, p. 238, misses "all the elevation, splendour, and soaring brevity of Isaiah." *Hitzig* finds that the slow movement in vers. 2–4 is not like Isaiah's. On the contrary, *Drechsler* on ver. 5 remarks correctly,

"Not without effect does the prophet speak so shortly and abruptly;" and at ver. 14, "How extremely lively is the representation through the whole of this first part! Nothing but challenges and questions! There are nine imperatives in the fourteen verses; twice is the figure of interrogation applied." *Ewald* himself admits in individual instances, "Many of Isaiah's words and thoughts resound here and there in the piece; as ver. 4, רוֹמֵם and גֹּדֶל, like i. 2; עֲלִיזָה, vers. 7, 12 [the verb here], like v. 14, xxii. 2, xxxii. 13; יָרוֹ נָמָה, ver. 11, like v. 25; especially ver. 13 sounds very like Isaiah, comp. xxxii. 14, xvii. 1." In addition, comp. מִימֵי קֶדֶם, xxiii. 7, with xxxvii. 26; the combination בַּחוּלַת בַּת, ver. 12, with xxxvii. 22, xlvii. 1 (imitated by Jer. xlvi. 11, Lam. i. 15, ii. 13); הָקֵל, ver. 9, with viii. 23; also ver. 9, with iv. 2, xiii. 9, and others besides. Against these the linguistic marks set up by *Hitzig* prove nothing; for neither can it be shown that זָנָה came at a later time to mean "to carry on trade" (vers. 15–17) through Nah. iii. 4, nor was the substantive מִכְסֶה first formed during the exile, comp. xiv. 11, xlix. [the verse is not given], and the analogous verbals, viii. 8, 23, xiv. 6, xxix. 3; and "the coincidence between ver. 7 and Zeph. ii. 15 merely shows that Zephaniah had this prophecy of Isaiah as well as others (comp. Note 10) before his eyes.

(29) Without vers. 15–18 the prophecy would contain only threatening, and no announcement of salvation, entirely against the analogy of the rest of the longer prophecies in this group; comp. xvi. 14 [4?], xviii. 7, xix. 16 ff. The connection of vers. 15–18 with the preceding announcement of judgment, is missed by *Ewald;* it lies, however, in the thought, "the worldly-minded Tyre shall one day offer its riches to the Holy One of Israel; yet there is no conversion without chastisement" (*Umbreit*). There is an allusion to this ethical relation of Tyre to Jehovah already in vers. 8, 9; comp. vers. 17 and 18, and ver. 12 with ver. 15 (*Häv.* p. 126). Also the statement of the seventy years (vers. 15 and 17) does not lead us to the time after the captivity; much rather are such determinations of time quite in the spirit of Isaiah (comp. *Jahn*, Einl. ii. p. 480; *Hengstb.* Beitrr. i. p. 184), which comes out still more strongly in the addition, "according to the days of one king," ver. 15; comp. xvi. 14, xxi. 16.

V. The genuineness of the longer prophecy, ch. xxiv.–xxvii., has often been denied, partly on account of some peculiar dogmatic representations, partly on account of its manifold affinities to other pieces in the book which are supposed not to be genuine, and on

account of its style (30). But how little the contents justify this conclusion, is shown by the great variety of our opponents' opinions as to the contents and the reference of this prophecy (31). So long as we conceive of this prophetic discourse as an isolated prophecy, it remains incomprehensible, because it is closely connected with the preceding prophecies, and forms their comprehensive conclusion, and can be rightly understood only in this its organic connection (32). The prophet compresses the judgments which go forth upon individual nations, tribes, and persons, in the ungodly world, into the collective image of a great universal judgment upon the whole world which is hostile to God; and he prophesies the redemption of the children of God from the judgment, and the glory and blessedness of the kingdom of God, which is to be erected upon the ruins of that world which has incurred this penalty of judgment in all its various forms and shapes. Not only does this announcement prove itself an integral portion of Isaiah's prophecies by its contents and its tendency (33); but it also bears witness to its genuineness by a multitude of our prophet's peculiar and characteristic images, turns, and expressions (34), with which its peculiar dogmatic representations and its diction do not conflict (35).

(30) Comp. *De Wette*, Einl. § 209*b*, where are brought together the reasons of the opponents of the genuineness (*Eichhorn*, *Bertholdt*, *Rosenmüller*, Scholia, first ed., *Gesenius*, *Hitzig*, *Umbreit*, *Ewald*, *Knobel*, and others). The genuineness is defended by *Rosenmüller*, Scholia, second ed.; *Arndt*, de loco. c. xxiv.–xxvii. Jesaj. vindicando et explic., Hamburg. 1826; *Häv.* p. 127 ff.; *Welte* on *Herbst's* Einl. ii. 2, p. 37 ff.; *Drechsler;* and *Delitzsch* on *Drechsler*, iii. p. 399.

(31) According to *Gesenius*, *Umbreit*, and *Knobel*, the prophecy treats of the downfall of Babylon; according to *Hitzig*, of the destruction of Nineveh (depicted by an Ephraimite living in Nineveh as an eye-witness); according to *Ewald*, ii. p. 506, the piece belongs to the time in which Cambyses was preparing for his expedition against Egypt; according to *Vatke*, bibl. Theol. i. p. 550, it belongs to the Maccabean age. Others have other opinions still. [*Bleek*, p. 463, thinks it probably written by some Jewish prophet in Judea or Jerusalem, after the fall of Assyria, which was viewed as a sign of universal judgment.]

(32) Comp. *Häv.* p. 129 f., and *Drechsler*, pp. 6, 7, 169 ff., and 222 ff. Not only does this prophecy often look back upon the earlier

ones,—comp. xxiv. 13 with xvii. 5, 6; xxiv. 16 with xxi. 2; xxvii. 9 with xvii. 8; xxv. 3 with xix. 8 [18?], xxiii. 18:—but much is also said in it of a land, and of a destruction taking place in it; of a city or cities, without anything to determine them more precisely (xxiv. 1–15); of enemies, violent and tyrannical men in power, whose fall is celebrated without any more exact designation of them (xxiv. 16, xxv. 2, 4, 5, xxvi. 10, 11, xxvii. 1, 4, 5, 7, 11); of cities with high walls, and of fortresses, which are to be thrown down and laid even with the ground, without any more precise statement in regard to them (xxv. 2, xxvi. 5, 6, xxvii. 10, 11). All this becomes intelligible for the first time, on the assumption that all the whole mass of enemies and opponents are here brought together, of whom the entire group ch. xiii.–xxiii. had treated one by one. Thus only can we explain how the judgment should fall on the entire covenant-breaking earth, the theocracy not excepted (xxiv. 1–13, 15, 16, 18–23); and how the salvation, whose dawn succeeds the judgment, should spread forth over the whole globe (xxv. 6–8, xxvi. 9, 21, xxvii. 1, 6), so that the delivered remnant, from all quarters of the earth, should praise the glory of God, and the captives, redeemed from Egypt and Assyria, should worship the Lord in Jerusalem (xxiv. 15, 16, xxvii. 13).—"This connection with ch. xiii.–xxiii. is not merely external: our prophecy is the internal fruit, the result of the intuitions which the prophet had received; and in it they for the first time find their proper termination, and appear to be exalted to their proper unity, and to be glorified in it" (*Häv.* p. 132).

(33) Our prophecy shows itself to be truly Isaiah's, as well by the similarity of its tendency to that of the preceding prophecies, as by its naming as the principal enemies of the theocracy, Moab, which is to be completely humbled and annihilated (xxv. 10 ff., corresponding to the picture in ch. xv. and xvi.), but especially Egypt and Assyria, as the principal representatives of the anti-theocratic worldly power (xxvii. 13, thoroughly like xi. 11, 16); and by its paraphrastic description of the idolatry which is to be extirpated by means of altars and pillars of Astarte and of the sun (xxvii. 9, as xvii. 8). In this, even *Ewald*, pp. 507 and 512, sees marks of Isaiah's style; but he puts them away from him by the worthless expedient of pronouncing them to be borrowed.

(34) To the circle of Isaiah's images belong the comparisons of the drunken man, xxiv. 20, like xix. 14; of the hammock [English version, "a cottage"], xxiv. 20, like i. 8; of stormy rain, xxv. 4, like iv. 6 and xxviii. 2; of bringing forth wind and stubble, xxvi. 17, 18, like xxxiii. 11; of the people likened to a vineyard, xxvii. 2 ff., like

v. 7 and iii. 14. Also comp. xxiv. 13 with xvii. 6, and xxvii. 10 with xxxii. 14. In the style of Isaiah are the form of the hymn of thanksgiving, in which the people give praise for the salvation experienced by them, xxv. 1 ff., comp. ch. xii.; the accumulation and enumeration of objects, the rich store of antitheses, verbal allusions, and instances of paronomasia, on account of which offence has been taken at this section, comp. only *Beckhaus*, p. 19 f., and *Kleinert*, pp. 279–282; along with which we must consider that here, especially in ch. xxiv., there is a great accumulation of words of similar sound to give vividness to the conception of exhaustive completeness (*Drechsler*, p. 177). These formulas are characteristic of Isaiah: "For Jehovah hath spoken," xxiv. 3, xxv. 8, comp. i. 2, 20, xxi. 17, xxii. 25, xl. 5, lviii. 14; בְּקֶרֶב הָאָרֶץ, xxiv. 13, found in Isaiah alone of all the prophets, comp. v. 8, vi. 12, vii. 22, x. 23, xix. 24; the combination of שָׁמִיר and שַׁיִת, xxvii. 4, like v. 6, vii. 23 ff., ix. 17, x. 17 (שַׁיִת being found only in Isaiah); the poetical expressions, חַפָּה and לְבָנָה, xxiv. 23, like xxx. 26; יָהּ combined with יְהוָה, xxvi. 4, like xii. 2; and such expressions as מְזַעַר, xxiv. 6, only in Isa. x. 25, xvi. 14, xxix. 17, תֹּהוּ, xxiv. 10, comp. xxix. 21, xxxiv. 11, עָלַיִ, xxiv. 8, like xxii. 2, xxxii. 13, xiii. 3, צָהֵל, xxiv. 14, comp. x. 30, xii. 6, liv. 1, and others besides. Comp. *Drechsler*, pp. 224–5.

(35) Later dogmatic representations, drawn from Parsism, are said to contain the doctrine of the punishment of the world of evil spirits, xxiv. 21, and the doctrine of the resurrection, xxvi. 14–19; but of neither has the Persian origin been proved. In addition, the thought in xxiv. 21, "Jehovah shall visit upon the host of the high ones (that is, dominions and principalities) on high, [or, of the height in the height], and the kings of the earth upon the earth," is preserved in so general a form, that no trace can be discovered of the representation peculiar to ancient Parsism, of the downfall of the comet Gurzscher, and the like. Again, it has been now proved that the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead is a later doctrine in Parsism, received from Judaism, and quite unknown to the genuine portions of the Zend-Avesta. Besides, it is not so determinately expressed in the passage referred to: there is simply the victory of the kingdom of God over death, with all its terrors, as a work of the Lord's creative omnipotence, which is also quickening like dew; and this is expressed as a certain hope, like Hos. xiii. 14 already, and still more distinctly in Ezek. xxxvii. 1 ff., a passage which looks back to this one. Finally, the critical objections to the diction and language of our chapters are founded partly on their agreement with other portions of Isaiah, which also are unjustly denied to be his; partly upon judgments of

subjective taste, that the representation is feeble, prolix, and so forth, which are quite worthless as critical proofs; specially as the pure Hebrew character of the diction is conceded (comp. *Knobel*, p. 324), and as our prophecy, like other assailed portions of Isaiah, is used by later prophets. Comp. for instance, Nah. ii. 11 with xxiv. 1; Jer. xxiii. 10, 11 with xxiv. 2, 4; Jer. xlviii. 43, 44 with xxiv. 17, 18, repeating this; Ezek. xxiv. 8 with xxvi. 21; and Ezek. xxix. 3 with xxvii. 1. Comp. *Häv.* p. 136.

§ 68. *Date of the Composition of ch.* xiii.–xxiii.

The connection in which this group of prophecies stands partly with ch. ii.–xii., as carrying out further the announcement in ch. vii. of the conflict of the theocracy with the worldly powers, partly subordinate to it, as unfolding one and the same idea by special examples, leads us at once to (speaking generally) one and the same period of the prophet's working; and in fact, according to its position and arrangement in the book of Isaiah, to the time *after* the first year of Ahaz, and *before* the fourteenth of Hezekiah.

I. The prophecy against Babylon, ch. xiii. and xiv., on account of its termination, xiv. 24–27, which goes back upon Assyria, and announces the downfall of this worldly power, must have been composed previous to the catastrophe which overwhelmed Sennacherib. At the same time, the many individual points of contact with the preceding discourses (comp. xiv. 4 with ix. 3; and xiv. 5, 6 with ix. 3, x. 5, 24), and the circumstance that it appears simply to expand and continue the discourse upon Assyria, speak in favour of its having been composed not long after the prophecy, x. 5–xii. 6; that is, in the first years of the reign of Ahaz (1).

(1) So *Vitringa;* and *Drechsler*, ii. p. 43.

II. The utterance respecting Philistia, ch. xiv. 28–32, according to its superscription, falls in the year of Ahaz's death, that is, shortly before Hezekiah's accession (2).

(2) The rejection of the superscription by *Hitzig* and *Knobel* is a violent stroke of criticism; for the contents of the utterance, rightly understood, do not compel us, with *Hitzig*, to place it at a later time, when the Assyrians under Tartan were marching against Ashdod

(xx. 1), nor with *Knobel*, in the time of the Syro-Ephraimite invasion.

III. The same date is assigned to the prophecy against Moab, ch. xv. and xvi.; partly on account of its position between xiv. 28 and xx. 1, and partly on account of its contents. For, on the one hand, a number of cities which formerly belonged to the kingdom of the Ten Tribes, in its possessions east of Jordan, are named as being in possession of Moab; and so they actually were, because the Moabites had taken advantage of the opportunity to recover their old possessions north of the Arnon (Num. xxi. 26–30, [and comp. Judg. xi. 13 ff.]), after the captivity of the eastern tribes by Tiglath-pileser (2 Kings xv. 29). And on the other hand, the determinate time in xvi. 14 points to the period in which Shalmaneser's expedition against Samaria falls; and probably that expedition was also the means of bringing in the threatened judgment upon Moab (3).

(3) Comp. *Hendewerk*, p. 385, and *Drechsler*, pp. 68 and 229; on the contrary, *Credner* (theol. Studien u. Kritik. 1833, p. 780) refers this oracle to the expedition of Tiglath-pileser, in the reign of Ahaz.

IV. The prophecy against Syria and Ephraim, ch. xvii. and xviii., about whose unity there has often been a mistake made, does not belong to the time before the expedition of Rezin and Pekah against Judah, but to somewhere about the time of Hezekiah's accession; since the announcement as to Ephraim in xvii. 3–6, 9, and that in ver. 1 as to Damascus, were first fulfilled in the expedition of Shalmaneser (4).

(4) *Drechsler* (theol. Studien u. Kritik. 1847, p. 847 ff.) was the first to establish convincingly their unity, about which even *Häv.* had still made a mistake. As to the date of composition, comp. *Drechsler*, Isa. ii. pp. 87–8 and 229; on the contrary, *Rosenmüller*, *Gesenius*, and *Ewald* place ch. xvii. 1–11, and *Hitzig* and *Häv.* place the whole chapter, in the earliest times of the reign of Ahaz, and they place ch. xviii. under Hezekiah.

V. In the same period falls the prophecy as to Egypt, ch. xix.; and only a little later, the utterance against Egypt and Ethiopia, ch. xx. By annihilating the kingdom of the Ten Tribes, Assyria paved

the way for itself into Egypt, which wished to come to the help of king Hoshea (2 Kings xvii. 4) (5).

(5) Comp. *Häv.* p. 76, *Drechsler*, pp. 102, 106, and 229 f. Erroneously, and in contradiction to i. 1, *Gesenius* and *Rosenmüller* place ch. xix. in the time of Manasseh, interpreting this oracle of the Dodekarchy in Egypt and of Psammetichus. Against this opinion, comp. *Hitzig*, p. 220.

VI. The utterances as to Babylon, xxi. 1–10, Edom, xxi. 11, 12, and the Arabs, xxi. 13–17, have been composed not long after ch. xx. The comparison of xxi. 1–10 with xiii. 1–xiv. 27 shows that ch. xxi. 1–10 belongs to a later period than the other. And the catastrophe announced as coming on the Arabs within a year's time (vers. 13–17) fits admirably into the expedition of Assyria against Egypt which is brought into view by ch. xx. 3, 4; and this expedition has also given occasion to the utterance against Edom (6).

(6) Comp. *Drechsler*, pp. 116, 120, and 230, with p. 43, note. It is arbitrary in *Hitzig* to reject the superscriptions, and to combine vers. 11 and 12 with vers. 13–18 into one oracle.

VII. The two prophecies in ch. xxii., which belong to one another and form a unity, in respect of both their position and their contents, were uttered, not during the time of Sennacherib's invasion of Judah, but before it, between that event and the fall of Samaria [eight years earlier, 2 Kings xviii. 10, 13]. And they were uttered in the order in which they stand in our book: first, the burden of the valley of vision (vers. 1–14), then that of Shebna (vers. 15–25); so that they occupy the right chronological position in the book. This is seen clearly, on the one hand, by the attack of Sennacherib upon Jerusalem being depicted as a thing still future, not as having already taken place, vers. 8–11, while the threatening in vers. 1–3 refers to the Chaldean catastrophe; on the other hand, by this fact, that at the time of Sennacherib's expedition against Jerusalem, the exaltation of Eliakim in the room of Shebna, which is predicted in ver. 20 ff., had already taken place: comp. xxxvi. 3, 22, xxxvii. 2 (7).

(7) So *Drechsler*, pp. 138, 148–9, with the older expositors. On the contrary, *Gesenius*, *Hitzig*, and *De Wette* place it during the time of the invasion by Sennacherib, on grounds which are untenable.

VIII. Also the prophecy against Tyre, ch. xxiii., belongs to this same period; since, after the fall of Samaria, Shalmaneser's troops overran the territory of Tyre, and besieged it five months, but were unable to take it (*Menander* in *Josephus*, Antiq. ix. 14, 2): according to its position, it is subsequent to the utterances in ch. xxii. (8). Finally, since ch. xxiv.–xxvii. form a comprehensive concluding address, this could not have been composed previous to the oracles which we have been hitherto considering; rather it must have been immediately subsequent to them. Accordingly, this cycle of prophecies is chronologically arranged.

(8) Comp. *Drechsler*, ii. pp. 148–9 and 230.

§ 69. *Date of Composition of ch.* xxviii.–xxxv., *and their Genuineness.*

The prophecies in ch. xxviii–xxxiii. refer to the Assyrian invasion; and by universal consent it is believed that they were uttered and composed within the first fourteen years of Hezekiah (1). Yet all the six chapters do not hang so closely together as to form only one greater whole, which came into existence all at once; but ch. xxviii. announces the destruction of Samaria as still impending (vers. 1–4) (2), whereas in ch. xxxiii. 7, 8, the invasion of Sennacherib is supposed to have already resulted and to be then present. Therefore ch. xxviii. must be dated before the sixth year of Hezekiah, more precisely within his first three years; while ch. xxxiii. cannot have been [redacted] before his fourteenth year (3). Again, the intervening cha[redacted]xii., which manifestly form one greater whole, closely [redacted]d in regard to contents and time of composition (4), b[redacted]rval between these two points of time; but we are unabl[redacted] with certainty, in view of their manifold references both to ch. xxviii. and to ch. xxxiii., whether they were composed soon after the former or shortly before the latter (5).

(1) Comp. *Caspari*, Beitrr. p. 62 ff., and *Drechsler*, ii. 2, pp. 2 ff., 145 f.

(2) Ch. xxviii. 1–4 does not bewail the fall of Samaria as having already taken place (*Hitzig*), but predicts it as still impending. This is clear from הוֹי, ver. 1, comp. with xxix. 1; from הִנֵּה, ver. 2, and

בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא, ver. 5; as also from the parallelism of ver. 2 with vers. 15, 17, 18, 19, compared with the parallelism of vers. 7, 8, with ver. 1. The grounds on which *Hitzig*, p. 333, combats this, and wishes to claim the composition of this chapter for the thirteenth or fourteenth year of Hezekiah, an opinion afterwards retracted (in his Comment. on the Minor Prophets, p. 176 of the second ed.), are quite inconclusive. Comp. *Caspari*, p. 64 ff., and *Drechsler*, p. 24, note.

(3) Ch. xxxiii. 7, 8 cannot be understood as a prediction of what is narrated in 2 Kings xviii. 14–17 (Calvin), but mentions facts which at the time have already occurred; so that this chapter cannot be placed, with *Häv.*, in the same period as ch. xxviii. Comp. *Caspari*, p. 70 ff.; where there is also a refutation of the opinion adopted by *Hitzig* and *Hendewerk*, that ch. xxxiii. originated by little and little at intervals.

(4) Comp. xxix. 15 with xxx. 1, 2, xxxi. 2; xxix. 1–4 with xxx. 15 f.; xxix. 1 with xxxii. 10; xxix. 5, 6 with xxx. 27 ff., xxxi. 8, 9; xxix. 17 with xxxii. 15; xxix. 18–21, 24 with xxxii. 3–8; xxx. 1–7 with xxxi. 1–3; and other places in *Caspari*, p. 100, note. The attempts of *Hitzig* and *Hendewerk* to determine the particular years, and seasons of years, in which these chapters were composed, are entirely nugatory. Comp. *Umbreit*, i. p. 268 ff., and *Häv.* p. 140 ff.

(5) See the reasons for and against in *Caspari*, p. 80 ff. He declares himself in favour of the earlier date: partly on account of the internal connection of ch. xxix.–xxxii. with ch. xxviii.; partly on account of ch. xxx. 22 and ch. xxxi. presupposing idolatry in Jerusalem at the time of their composition, this having been extirpated after the passover held in the fifth or sixth year of Hezekiah (2 Chron. xxx. 14 [illegible] But neither reason is decisive; for xxx. 22 and xxxi. [illegible] entire abandonment of idolatry in the Messianic age.

T[illegible]ennacherib's expedition belongs also the prophecy, in ch. [illegible] xxxv., of the judgment upon all the enemies of the theocracy, upon the collective worldly power in its hostility to God, represented by Edom; and of the magnificent glorification of the people and the kingdom of God, of which this is to be the dawn. We affirm this on account of the close connection in which this prophecy stands with the discourses in ch. xxviii.–xxxiii. (6), in regard both to its contents as a whole and to its aim (7).

(6) Even *Ewald*, ii. p. 488, finds it "very noteworthy that much in ch. xxxv. re-echoes almost verbally to Isa. xxxii. xxxiii.: ver. 2

like xxxiii. 6 [9 ?], ver. 3 an echo of xxxiii. 9, ver. 4–6 of xxxii. 4–6, xxxiii. 23, 24; while it is impossible to separate ch. xxxiv. from ch. xxxv. in any way." And on account of נִמְהֲרִי לֵב in xxxv. 4, *Hitzig* also admits that in these words the writer thought of Isa. xxxii. 3, 4, xxix. 8. [This and the following note occur in the reverse order in the original, owing to the difference in the arrangement of words in the German sentence.]

(7) "Propheta—superiores vaticinationes de gravissimis judiciis, ecclesiæ procedente tempore infligendis veluti obsignaturus, in hac prophetia se directe convertit ad hostes ecclesiæ confœderatos—populo Dei maxime formidabiles [Esau being the counterpart or antithesis to Jacob in prophecy]—iisque denuntiat *judicium Dei completorium*, quod exhiberet specimen et exemplum omnis vindictæ huc usque de hostibus ecclesiæ sumptæ; ac proinde ecclesiæ præstaret ingens status sui incrementum et prosperitatem cum jubilo ob hostium obstinatorum interitum conjunctam" (*Vitringa*, ii. p. 269). He also rightly perceived so long ago that both chapters form one cohering prophecy, and must not be separated; though this is done by *Eichhorn*, *Rosenmüller*, and *Hitzig*. Comp. also *Gesenius*, i. p. 908; *Ewald*, ii. p. 487; *Häv.* p. 143. The separation rests only upon the false assumption that ch. xxxiv. is a special threatening of judgment, directed exclusively against Edom.

There is the fullest security for the genuineness of ch. xxviii.–xxxiii.: since their contents agree perfectly with the relations of Isaiah's time, and the diction and style have Isaiah's peculiarities stamped on them; and this is almost universally acknowledged (8). On the contrary, it is denied that ch. xxxiv. and xxxv. are his, and they are transferred to the times of the Babylonian captivity (9); yet only on account of unjustifiable assumptions, and with unimportant objections (10). For the undeniable connection of this prophecy with the preceding chapters bears as strong testimony to their genuineness (comp. Notes 6 and 7), as does the fact that already Jeremiah and Ezekiel, and even Zephaniah, knew them and made use of them, to the impossibility of the assumption that they originated during the exile (11).

(8) Comp. *Gesenius*, p. 824; *Hitzig*, pp. 331–2, and others. Comp. *Beckhaus*, p. 149 f., upon Koppe's doubts as to the genuineness of xxx. 1–27. And *Ewald's* objections to the genuineness of ch. xxxiii., which he supposes may have been written out by a disciple of the

prophet, are destitute of any foundation; they rest partly upon exaggerations, partly upon a mistake as to the manifest fact that this chapter has to some extent a lyrical and pictorial character. Comp. *Caspari*, Beitrr. p. 28 ff., and *Häv.* pp. 141–2.

(9) By those critics who transfer ch. xiii.–xiv. 23 to the time of the captivity (comp. § 67, Note 6): only that some (*Gesenius, Hitzig*) hold that the author is the same person as the author of ch. xl.–lxvi.; while others (*Ewald, Umbreit*) distinguish him from this "great unknown." Against them comp. *Häv.* p. 142 ff., and *Caspari* in *Rudelbach* and *Guericke's* Zeitschrift, 1843, ii. p. 1 ff.

(10) The chief argument is the affinity with the other portions of this book supposed to be of the age of the captivity: xxxiv. 4 with xiii. 10; ver. 11 ff. with xiii. 20 ff.; xxxv. 1 ff. with lv. 12, xl. 5, lx. 1, lxii. 11; ver. 3 with xl. 1, 2, 9, 10; ver. 5 with xlii. 16; vers. 6, 7 with xliii. 19, 20, xlviii. 21, xlix. 11, 12 [10, 11?]; ver. 8 with xl. 3, 4, xlix. 11, lxii. 10; ver. 10 with li. 11 (comp. *De Wette*). Add to this the glowing hatred of Edom; and (particularly according to *Hitzig*) exaggerated and bombastic delineation, later ideas (for instance, of field devils), and later linguistic usage. But the two first points, so far as they are based on truth and not on mere exaggeration, are deprived of all weight by this circumstance, that Edom is here depicted, not as an individual nation, but as the representative of the worldly power in its hostility to God, in accordance with its animus against the kingdom of God. The two other points contain unfounded assumptions. On the alleged later linguistic usage, comp. *Häv.* i. 1, pp. 227–8. Isaiah's characteristic diction and style are to be seen so early as in the introduction, xxxiv. 1, which reminds us of i. 2; in the עַמִּים, ver. 1, a well-known peculiar word of his, comp. xxii. 24; and הַחֲרִים, xxxiv. 2, like xi. 15; the use of יָרַד for "coming down violently" [xxxiv. 7?], as in xxxii. 19; the imagery taken from the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, vers. 9 and 10, reminding us of i. 9, 10, iii. 9, xiii. 19; and the instances of agreement between ch. xxxv. and ch. xxxii. xxxiii. which have been adduced in Note 6.

(11) Isa. xxxiv. 5–8, in Jer. xlvi. 10; Isa. xxxiv. 6, in Jer. xxv. 31; Isa. xxxiv. 2, in Jer. xxv. 33, 34; Isa. xxxiv. 7, in Jer. l. 27; Isa. xxxiv. 6, in Jer. li. 40; Isa. xxxiv. 14, in Jer. l. 39; Isa. xxxiv. 3, in Ezek. xxxii. 5, 6, and xxxix. 11; Isa. xxxiv. 6, 7, in Ezek. xxxix. 17–19; finally, Isa. xxxiv. 6 and 11, in Zeph. i. 7, 8, ii. 14. Comp. *Küper*, Jerem. p. 79 sq.; and especially *Caspari*, in the article referred to in Note 9. He not only gives copious proofs that Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Zephaniah had read the prophecy against Edom in Isa. xxxiv., and had adopted thoughts, images, and expressions from it in several

of their prophecies; but also he has thoroughly refuted the opinions adopted in opposition, that either the author of Isa. xxxiv. had the chapters of Jeremiah and Ezekiel in question floating before his mind's eye (*Ewald*, *Umbreit*), or that passages bearing affinity to Isa. xxxiv. had found their way by interpolation into Jer. li. and lii. (*Movers*, *Hitzig* on Jer. l. 39). See also *Delitzsch* on *Drechsler*, iii. p. 406.

§ 70. *Upon ch.* xxxvi.–xxxix.

This section narrates the repeatedly announced invasion by the Assyrian army under Sennacherib, and its subsequent annihilation, with the discourses uttered on this occasion by Isaiah; and the immediate consequences of this event for the theocracy in general, and for king Hezekiah in particular. It is found also in 2 Kings xviii. 13-xx. 19, mostly word for word: yet along with this there are various deviations, some greater, some smaller; from a careful comparison of which the proof emerges, that neither of these two accounts is borrowed from the other, but that both are extracted from a third account, fuller in its historical statements, as it was found in the chronicles of the kings of Judah (2 Kings xx. 20) (1). Now this fuller narrative was taken into the chronicles of the kings from the חזון of Isaiah, according to 2 Chron. xxxii. 32; while yet this is not to be identified with our book of Isaiah, if we may judge from the mutual relations of the extract from these chronicles in 2 Kings xviii.–xx. and our ch. xxxvi.–xxxix. Then Isaiah himself must have noted down the events and discourses of this time, either contemporaneously with the occurrences, or shortly afterwards, in the vision which was incorporated with the chronicles; and afterwards, when editing the collection of his prophecies, he must have introduced into it the principal contents of that vision, yet working them up freely: while the more recent author of the book of Kings extracted his account from the Chronicles [not our canonical book, of course] with historical fidelity, yet not word for word (2).

(1) See the critical comparison of the two accounts in *my* apologet. Versuch üb. die Chron. p. 223 ff., with the proof that their relation is as stated here. *Ewald* (Leipz. Allgemein. Litter. Zeitung, 1833, August-heft, Nr. 188, p. 1502), *Movers* (d. bibl. Chron. p. 187), *Hitzig*, *Umbreit*, and *Knobel* (on Isa. xxxvi.), *Häv.* p. 147 ff., and *De*

Wette, § 212, have also decided in favour of this view. The greater completeness of the common source of information is at once clear from these two facts: on the one hand, some important circumstances, narrated in 2 Kings xviii. 14–16 and 17, are wanting in Isa. xxxvi.; on the other hand, the song of Hezekiah (Isa. xxxviii. 9–20) is wanting in Kings.—The remarks upon the mutual relation of the two accounts by the editors of *Drechsler's* Comment. ii. 2, p. 151 ff., are unsatisfactory. [*Delitzsch*, in his Commentary, pp. 352–3, thinks that the text in Kings is somewhat purer; yet that the text in Isaiah is the original, from which the other is taken.]

(2) There is really nothing in the objections of *Hendewerk*, i. p. 678, *Hitzig*, p. 410, and others, to the belief that Isaiah wrote these chapters. Such are the use of the third person in speaking of the prophet, which is connected with the objective character of the historical representation, as in vii. 1 ff.; and the argument drawn from the marvellous features of the history, the predictions in xxxvii. 7 and xxxviii. 5, and the miracles in xxxvii. 36 and xxxviii. 8, for a later origin of these myths, which merely proves that those who argue so are embarrassed by doctrinal prejudices; and the assumption that the book of Isaiah was not collected till a later time (comp. § 72).—The whole section contains not a few genuine traces of Isaiah's style, without any appearance whatever of a later style of language, so far as can be proved (comp. my apologet. Versuch, pp. 231–2): and even the passage Isa. xxxvii. 38, comp. 2 Kings xix. 37, which looks back upon the murder of Sennacherib as having already taken place, presents no certain trace of another or a later hand than Isaiah's (*Hitzig, Häv.* p. 150); since the year adopted as that of Sennacherib's death, B.C. 696, is not historically certain, and there are no well-founded objections to the supposition that Isaiah lived on to the time of Manasseh, and edited a collection of his prophecies in the evening of his days. [*Bleek*, p. 466, makes the collector of the prophecies insert this historical passage on account of its naming Babylon, to which the following prophecies refer; but at p. 467 he seems inclined to make these prophecies be attributed to Isaiah, on account of this mention of Babylon in ch. xxxix.]

§ 71. *Date of Composition and Genuineness of ch.* xl.–lxvi.

This lengthened series of prophetic discourses respecting the future redemption of the people of God and the glorification of the theocracy into the magnificence of the perfected divine kingdom

(these topics being combined into one greater whole by their unity of contents and of spirit, as well as by their similarity in language and representation), is the work of a single author (1). That author is Isaiah, who composed it in the last period of his prophetic agency, after the downfall of the Assyrian worldly power under Sennacherib (or otherwise, within the last fifteen years of Hezekiah), as a prophetic legacy for the comfort of all believers in the times of severe tribulation during the captivity.

Our prophet was filled with the certainty that the omnipotence of the Holy One of Israel, according to the unchangeable divine purpose, was to execute the judgment repeatedly announced to the kingdom of Judah, of destruction at the hands of the heathenish worldly power; and not only this, but was also to effect the predicted annihilation of that worldly power in the very zenith of its greatness [see ch. x. 12, etc.]. And his spirit immersed itself into that future in which Israel, sighing under the hard oppression of Babylon, should long for redemption from the bondage of their sins; and in the Spirit he announced the future revelation of the glory of the Lord in the superabundant fulness of the salvation provided for His people. The dawn of this salvation should be seen in the downfall of Babylon and the redemption of Israel from their captivity by means of Coresh [that is, Cyrus], the anointed of Jehovah. It should be unfolded in the victory of the truth and knowledge of God over the inanity of idolatry, and in the blotting out of the guilt of the people by Jehovah's Servant. And it should be perfected by the gathering together of the scattered children of God to Zion; which should be purified from all evil, should have its foundations laid by the Lord in connection with new heavens and a new earth, and should be lightened up with His divine glory.

(1) The unity of these chapters, in opposition to *Koppe*, *Martini* comment. in l. Jes. lii. 13–liii. 12 (Rostochii 1791), p. 5 sq., *Bertholdt*, *Eichhorn*, and *Knobel*, has been sufficiently proved by *Gesenius*, ii. p. 3 ff.; *Hitzig*, p. 457 ff.; *De Wette*, § 208, *b*; *Hengstb.* Christol. ii. p. 189 ff. *Ewald's* attempt, in opposition to this (ii. p. 407 ff.), to explain individual portions, like liii. 1–12 and lvi. 9–lvii. 11, as repetitions, word for word, from older prophets, and lxiii. 7–lxvi. as a later supplement, does not need a serious refutation. Comp. against it *E. Meier* (theolog. Studien u. Krit. 1845, pp. 884–5); *Caspari*, in

Rudelbach and *Guericke's* Zeitschrift, 1843, ii. pp. 46–7; *Delitzsch, ibid.* 1850, pp. 31–32, and on *Drechsler*, iii. p. 361 ff.; and others. [Yet *Bleek*, pp. 454–7, while holding that this section is all by a single author, still thinks that lvi. 9–lvii. 11 was an older piece, possibly by Isaiah himself, taken up and inserted by the unknown writer; who did not write the whole section at once, but composed lxiii.–lxvi., or perhaps even lviii.–lxvi., after his return to Canaan.]

These chapters are very confidently denied to be Isaiah's, and are attributed to an unnamed prophet in the last period of the captivity (2); but the rejection of their genuineness rests entirely upon mere false assumptions as to the nature of biblical prophecy, and upon consequent misunderstanding of the ideal contents of this prophecy, and upon other frivolous reasons. Our opponents urge principally the prophetic point of view in these discourses; since the prophet never simply announces the captivity beforehand, but everywhere supposes that it has already taken place without having prophesied its occurrence; and they pronounce it to be psychologically an impossible fiction for one to transport himself so into the future. Thus they deny, not only the possibility of a supernatural vision of the future, but also the natural points of contact which were already given for such a revelation of things to come in the ideas about the future of the theocracy, which were wide-spread in Israel as early as the time of Isaiah (3); and thus, too, they are driven to unjustifiable interpretations of the whole and of the individual parts.

(2) By the critics who place ch. xiii.–xiv. in the time of the captivity (§ 67, Note 6). [*Bleek*, p. 451, who is himself decidedly of this opinion, says there were hints given by *Aben Ezra* in his commentary on ch. xl. xlix. liii.] *Ewald*, ii. p. 409 ff., makes the writer live in Egypt, more precisely in Pelusium, and holds that he was a Jew who had migrated thither with Jeremiah; but he has been already refuted by *E. Meier, ibid.* p. 875 ff.—The genuineness was defended on weak grounds by *Beckhaus*, p. 152 ff.; *Greve*, ultima capp. Jes., Amstel. 1810; *Möller*, de authent. oracc. Jes. xl.–lxvi.; by *Jahn* and *Dereser:* more profoundly by *Kleinert, ibid.; Häv.* p. 155 ff.; *Stier*, Jesai.; *Hengstb.* Christol. ii. p. 195 ff.; *Delitzsch* on *Drechsler*, iii. p. 386 ff.; and others, [such as *Alexander* on Isaiah, and *Delitzsch* in his own work on Isaiah].

(3) The embarrassment of our opponents with critical prejudices

comes out particularly plainly in *Hitzig's* case. In plain words, p. 463, he affirms that we cannot attribute to the prophets any proper foreknowledge; but that their foreknowledge must be confined within the limits of what we name anticipation, and of inference from facts lying before them and from actual or supposed truths: and by this means the prophets of the true God are disparaged and turned into common soothsayers. In reply, it is sufficient to remark that Isaiah, like all true prophets, was enlightened by the Spirit of God; and that, in virtue of this enlightenment, he was able to foresee and foretell the captivity long before it came; nay more, that he was able to make it present to himself, and to take his point of view in it, and from this to prophesy of the redemption of Israel. With respect to both of these ideas, there lay already in the law the germs and points of contact for the supernatural revelation. With respect to the *former*, in that old prophetic truth of the law, that on account of the persistent apostasy of Israel they should be cast out of the inheritance given to them, and that on account of their heathenish idolatry they should be scattered among the heathen (Lev. xxvi. 31–41; Deut. xxviii. 32–34, 36, 37, 49–57, 62–68); with respect to the *latter*, in the truth which is no less clear, that, in spite of their being cast out from the Lord's presence, Israel, as the covenant people, should not wholly perish, but that, in virtue of their divine election, the remnant of the people, purified by tribulation, should be again received into favour and should be glorified (Lev. xxvi. 42–45; Deut. xxx. 1–10). On the footing of these prophetic truths, uttered so early as by Moses, and acknowledged by Solomon even in the most flourishing age of the theocracy (1 Kings viii. 46–50, ix. 6–9), not only did Isaiah predict the judgments impending over the apostate people, as for instance in ch. i. and v., which rest entirely upon Lev. xxvi. and Deut. xxviii. (comp. § 34, Note 14), and the glorification of the remnant, purified by tribulation, which was to begin after these judgments (i. 25–27, iv. 2–6, vi. 13, and others); but Micah also announced in distinct words that Judah should be carried away to Babylon, and there should be redeemed (iv. 10); treating these as coming events, of whose undoubted certainty a warning prognostic had been given in the time of Hezekiah, when the kingdom of Israel had been destroyed and the Ten Tribes had been carried into exile.—How well known and wide-spread the announcement of the captivity was in Isaiah's age, is also clear from the way and manner in which he announced to king Hezekiah the carrying away of all his treasures and of his sons to Babylon, and from the way in which the king received the announcement (Isa. xxxix. 6–8). If we have weighed

all this, we will no longer hold it a psychological impossibility that Isaiah should transport himself to that time in which this announcement should be fulfilled, and the people should find themselves in the captivity.

Neither the addresses to the people of Israel in captivity, nor the prophetic and pictorial details contained in these chapters, prove the captivity to be the firm historical ground on which the prophet stands. But both of these particulars of essential moment are explained by the prophet's *ideal* point of view (4), piercing through which, indeed, the age of Isaiah shines with tolerable distinctness as the real historical background (5).

(4) The analogies of other prophets transporting themselves into the future, and forth from it prophesying of a future still more distant (in *Hengstb.* Christol. ii. p. 196 ff.), certainly prove the possibility of such an ideal point of view; yet they do not go so far as to be a complete explanation of this section, since Isaiah makes an important advance beyond this, and immerses himself so entirely in the age of the captivity, that he seems to live and move in it. Nevertheless, he neither oversteps the limits of prophecy, nor denies his ideal point of view; but he depicts that future which he sees in spirit, not as it actually was in history, but only according to certain general ideas, as a time at which Jehovah would reveal to all the world His omnipotence and divinity as against the idol nullities of the heathen by the downfall of Babylon and its gods, and by the redemption and glorification of His people Israel.—*Coresh* [that is, *Cyrus*] (xliv. 28, xlv. 1) is certainly mentioned: yet he is not depicted as the king of Persia, in the manner of his appearance in history, but is predicted in thoroughly ideal lineaments, merely as a hero wakened up from the sunrising by Jehovah to carry out His purpose upon the Chaldeans, like the bright sun in the east, according to the appellative signification of his name; comp. *Häv.* p. 163 ff.; and on the opposite side, *Delitzsch* on *Drechsler*, iii. p. 390, [and in his own Commentary, so far, p. 443]. But except this, the whole contains nothing whatever in the utterances which refer to the captivity of historical details as to the overthrow of Babylon (such as are to be found in Jer. l. and li. for instance), or as to the return of Israel out of the captivity, to justify us in deciding that the prophet stands on solid historical ground, in all that he says of the captivity and of the condition of the people while in it. And just as little are ideas and representations found in the Messianic

announcements, such as we cannot conceive in the age of Isaiah, or such as can be explained only as belonging to the times of the captivity.

For that the discourse of the prophet is almost throughout addressed to the people of Israel languishing in Babylon, that Jerusalem and the cities of Judah are represented as destroyed, and the land as laid waste, while the Chaldeans appear standing in the very zenith of their power,—all this by no means proves that the prophet lived with his people in the captivity, but is perfectly conceivable by his spiritual immersion in this period and its relations. This explains everything that is predicted of Israel being redeemed from Babylon and led back to Zion, and of Jerusalem and the cities of Judah being rebuilt: the announcement of these things is so ideal, that nothing else than utter want of understanding can interpret them of the historical expeditions of the exiles returning to their fatherland through the wilderness which lay between Babylon and Judea, or can restrict the building of "the old waste places" and "the desolations of many generations" (lviii. 12, lxi. 1) to the rebuilding of the cities destroyed by the Chaldeans (against which, see the right view in *Häv.* p. 159), and thence draw the inference that the writer must have lived at the end of the captivity.—Not the historical relations, as they took shape about the time when Cyrus appeared, but the great doings of God for His people under Moses and Joshua, form the substratum of the prophetic picture of the redemption of Israel and their return into the Lord's land, the radiance of whose glory should infinitely transcend that of all the earlier doings of God.

But as regards the Messianic contents of this section, neither the idea of Jehovah's Servant, nor the likeness sketched of Him, is a growth of the soil of the captivity. For Jehovah's Servant, called to be the Mediator of the covenant of the people and to be the light of the heathen, to open the blind eyes and to let the prisoners go out of the prison, to gather Israel to the Lord and to raise up the tribes of Israel, to bring forth judgment to the peoples who wait for His law, and Himself to be Jehovah's salvation to the ends of the earth (xlii. 1–7, xlix. 1–8); who patiently endures mockery, and scorn, and smiting; who by His sufferings and death as the Righteous One bears and atones for the sins of His people, and after surrendering His soul to be a guilt-offering shall see His seed, shall prolong His days, shall divide the spoil with the strong, and shall be exalted to such glory that kings shall be dumb with astonishment at Him (l. 4 ff., lii. 13–liii.);—this Servant of Jehovah is not the people of

Israel in its attitude towards the heathen nations during the captivity (*Rosenmüller*, *Hitzig*, and others); nor the young growth of the nation, young Israel in opposition to the old who were incorrigible (*Hendewerk*); nor the pious portion of the people (*Maurer*, *Ewald*, *Knobel*); nor Israel in its prophetic calling suffering for the heathen world (*Hofmann*, Weissagung u. Erfüllung); nor, finally, the prophetic class or order (*Gesenius; De Wette; Umbreit*, d. Knecht Gottes, Hamburg 1840). But, on the contrary, "as Jehovah's Servant is more than a prophet, inasmuch as the isles shall wait for His law; and as He is more than a priest, inasmuch as He offers up Himself; so He is also more than a king, inasmuch as kings are made to tremble at His glory. Jehovah's Servant is no mere prophet, nor mere priest, nor mere king; He is nothing of any one of these exclusively, but He is all together: it is simply three radiations of His one glory" (*Delitzsch* in *Rudelbach* and *Guericke's* Zeitschrift, 1850, p. 34). Also this Servant of God is not "an empty ideal, to which the prophet has lent the embodiment of a person;" nor "the Church of Israel true to its calling;" nor the *ecclesia pressa* of the captivity (*Delitzsch*, pp. 36–7); nor "the true Israel, yet conceived as concrete in an individual," "the prototype of Israel" (*Hävernick*, Vorless. ü. d. Theologie d. Alt. Test., edited by *H. A. Hahn*, Erlangen 1848, p. 221 ff.); nor "partly collective Israel, partly Messiah as the Mediator who fulfils the prophetic calling of Israel" (*Hofmann*, Schriftbeweis, ii. 1. p. 90 ff.); nor yet "Israel and the Messiah conceived as in mystical unity" (*Drechsler* in his liter. Nachlass, in *Rudelbach* and *Guericke's* Zeitschrift, 1852, p. 258 ff.). Therefore, neither can this idea be explained from the history of the [pretended] prophet's time: nor yet can the prophecy of the representative and atoning sufferings and death of the Servant of God be derived from contemplating the sufferings of the pious Israelites for Jehovah's name's sake; because (as comes out clearly from Ps. xliv.) such endurance and suffering on the part of the martyrs could not be regarded as a vicarious suffering by the just for the unjust, or as a propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of the people, and a compensation for the suspension during the captivity of the sacrificial worship appointed by the law.

Jehovah's Servant is He whom Jehovah planted in Israel to grow up as a shoot out of a dry ground, a rod growing out from the root of Jesse, whose stem had been hewn down (Isa. liii. 2, comp. with xi. 1); who, as the flower and crown of the people of God, realizes the ideal destiny of the people of God: that is, the Messiah, who unites and completely represents in His own person the three offices — pro-

phetical, priestly, and royal—which were separated in the theocracy; who, as prophet, priest, and king, at the same time elevates Israel to be "a kingdom of priests" and "a holy nation" (Ex. xix. 6), and is Mediator of Jehovah's everlasting covenant with His people for "the sure mercies of David" (Isa. lv. 3). Comp. *Hengstb.* Christol. ii. p. 221 ff.; and *Delitzsch* on *Drechsler*, iii. p. 365 ff. and p. 373 ff. [In his own commentary *Drechsler* makes this Servant a pyramid, its base being all Israel, its apex the Messiah, rising through the true Israel.]—The subjective point of contact for the conception of Messiah as Jehovah's Servant is formed by the idea that the people chosen to be Jehovah's first-born son (Ex. iv. 22), by being placed under the law, was declared practically to be Jehovah's servant; and that in its prophetical, priestly, and royal orders, it had the divinely appointed means for realizing its ideal destiny of son or holy people to Jehovah. The development of this idea given in the section now under consideration, that the people as a whole are not the true Servant of Jehovah, but that He shall rise up only when there is a remnant purified by severe judgments and sufferings, in no way presupposes the actual captivity of the people: but only, on the one hand, the certainty of this judgment which was impending over Judah, to be scattered among the heathen and to suffer in the course of this scattering; and, on the other hand, firm faith in the inviolable truth of Israel's everlasting destiny, in virtue of which the chosen people cannot perish, but only shall be refined into that holy seed from which the true Servant of Jehovah shall be raised up by the Lord, who shall realize that everlasting destiny of Israel. Now that certainty and this faith are already found in those prophecies of Isaiah whose genuineness is universally acknowledged. And even if it was so, that this idea of Jehovah's true Servant could assume a distinct form, only when conditioned by the conviction that the existing kingdom should perish, and that the Levitical sacrificial worship should cease; still this conviction had already become a truth in Israel by means of Hos. iii. 5.—Then the further development of this idea produced the image of the perfected kingdom of God, in which the theocracy was to be glorified. Compare the article, das Ideal des Staates nach Jes. xl.–lxvi. in *Harless*, Zeitschrift für Protestantismus N. F. 1851, xxi. p. 85 ff.

(5) Whilst, as a consequence of what has been said, no idea expressed in this section presupposes the exile as actually having occurred; on the contrary, there are not wanting hints and allusions in reference to the age in which the prophet really lived. That he lived long before the exile is shown at once by passages like xli.

26, 27, xlii. 9, xliii. 9-13, xlv. 21, xlvi. 10, xlviii. 3, 5; in which the downfall of Babylon and the liberation of Israel from the exile are represented as new events of which no one had heard, which Jehovah caused to be proclaimed before they had sprung forth, that is, before the appearance of the earliest traces of them (comp. *Häv.* pp. 184–5): with which the appeal to older prophecies now in course of fulfilment, xli. 22, xlii. 9, xlv. 19, 21, xlvi. 10, xlviii. 16, is not in the least at variance; for there is not the slightest hint that these prophecies relate to the exile and the deliverance from it (*Häv.* p. 171).—That the author of these prophecies lived in Jerusalem or Judah, and in fact before the overthrow of the kingdom of Judah and the destruction of Jerusalem, is shown on the one hand by the addresses to Jerusalem and the cities of Judah, xl. 2, 9, comp. xli. 27, li. 17, lxii. 1 ff. (comp. *Häv.* p. 186): on the other hand, and still more, by the rebukes of sins prevailing among the people, such as intermitting the sacrificial worship, xliii. 22 ff.; offering sacrifice with unholy dispositions, lxvi. 3 f.; idolatry of all sorts, lvii. 3 ff., lxv. 3 ff.; and courting the favour of foreign rulers, lvii. 9, 10, comp. with xxx. 1 ff., xxxi. 1 ff. Comp. *Häv.* p. 187. Finally, it is proved by Egypt, Ethiopia, and Seba being named as the mightiest kingdoms of that time, xliii. 3, xlv. 14, comp. with xix. 9 ff., xviii. 2, 7; and still more plainly by the passage ch. lii. 4, where, in opposition to the oppression by Egypt in the beginning, the *Assyrian* is set down as the last (even if we retain the translation "without cause," instead of "at the end") which Israel should experience. With this comp. further *Kleinert*, p. 305 ff., *Hengstb.* Christol. ii. p. 199 ff., and *Hahn* on *Drechsler*, iii. p. xvii. f.; against which the objections of *Delitzsch*, *ibid.* p. 386 ff., cannot deprive this argument of its force.

Still less can a valid argument against the genuineness of these chapters, or for their composition during the exile, be drawn from their linguistic character, or from the absence of any appeal to this prophecy in Jer. xxvi. So far as there really is a diversity of representation, it is explained by the peculiar contents and aim of these discourses (6). The language is shown to be that of Isaiah, not only by its freedom from later characteristics and from Chaldaisms, but also by certain of his characteristic peculiarities (7). And the *argumentum a silentio* taken from Jer. xxvi. is abundantly outweighed by undeniable traces of acquaintance with these prophecies and use of them, not only by Jeremiah and Ezekiel, but also by Zephaniah and

Habakkuk (8). These chapters have the fullest right to take their place in the book of Isaiah as its closing section (9); and they have been acknowledged with one voice, by the Jewish synagogue and by the Christian Church, as they are acknowledged in the New Testament, to be the predictions of this prophet (10).

(6) It is impossible to avoid noticing that the representation in ch. xl.–lxvi. on the whole has greater clearness, transparency, ease, fluency, copiousness, and breadth, than the acknowledged genuine discourses in the first part; for their prevailing character is brief and compressed expression, with rapid changes of the images, to which there is often a mere allusion, giving rise here and there to obscurity in the discourse. But this diversity is perfectly explained by the diversity in the object handled. The discourses in the first part, of which these are the distinctive marks, taken collectively, are of a threatening nature, for which brevity and force of expression are just as suitable, as is a clearer and easier flow of discourse, and a rich fulness of pictorial imagery, for the announcement of a superabundant salvation. And in this latter part of the book the accumulation of manifold appositions, especially when Jehovah is named, will the less surprise us, just the more that we consider the greatness of the salvation, transcending all their hopes, which Jehovah had resolved to prepare for His people. Add to this, that the prophecies in the first part consist of discourses which were publicly delivered, in presence of the people, in very difficult circumstances, and in very agitated times: whereas these last chapters unmistakeably contain the well-thought-out result of the prophet's spiritual occupation with the future of the theocracy, and the higher revelations and intuitions which were vouchsafed to him partly in connection with this occupation; the whole being wrought up by him after his retirement from public life, and committed to writing for posterity.—Moreover, "this is the very foundation of Isaiah's greatness, as it is generally one of those things in which he stands out most pre-eminently, that whatever may be demanded by the subject of which he treats, every kind of discourse and every form of representation is ready at command" (*Ewald*, i. p. 143). Finally, these chapters exhibit not a few of Isaiah's characteristic peculiarities of manner and representation: for instance, the frequent and peculiar application and combination of antithesis, paronomasia and play upon words, accumulated enumerations of objects, new paragraphs so as to form refrains and graduated rhythm, insertion of songs, which are chiefly hymns of thanksgiving, rarely

visions or symbolical actions, etc. Comp. the evidences of all this in *Kleinert*, p. 279 ff., and *Häv.* p. 191 ff.

(7) The few Chaldaisms, such as אֲנַאלְתִּי, lxiii. 3, and הֶחֱלִי, liii. 10, are of a poetical kind; and they are proofs of the age of the exile just as little as is סָנְנִים, xli. 25, a word which Isaiah might quite well have appropriated to his own use, from the intercourse subsisting at that time between the Jews and the Assyrians (comp. *Häv.* i. 1, p. 228 ff.). The peculiarities adduced by our opponents, and accumulated in an uncritical manner, particularly by *Knobel*, Jes. p. xxvii. f., are either explained by the nature of the object under discussion, since a portion so extensive as this cannot be conceived as wanting many peculiar ideas and words (comp. *Kleinert*, p. 250 ff., and *Delitzsch* on *Drechsler*, iii. p. 403); or they do not occur throughout,—for instance, "the Servant of Jehovah" (whether Israel or Messiah) is found only in ch. xl.–xlviii.; or they rest only upon a false interpretation, like צֶדֶק and צְדָקָה in the supposed meaning, "salvation, victory," מִשְׁפָּט, "religion," בָּחַר, "to try," etc.; or they are found also in the [admittedly] genuine Isaiah, like אִיִּים, "isles, distant maritime lands," comp. xi. 11, תֹּהוּ, comp. xxix. 21, חֹשֶׁךְ, "darkness, hence misfortune," comp. viii. 22 [חֲשֵׁכָה], ix. 1. On the contrary, the peculiarities of Isaiah's style are so significant, and they penetrate the work so thoroughly, that they cannot be regarded as trifles, or explained as imitation or writing over again. For instance, there is frequently "the Holy One of Israel," xli. 14, 16, 20, etc. (in general, fourteen times in these chapters); the use of נִקְרָא, to be named, for "to be and to be acknowledged," xlvii. 1, 4 [?], 5, xlviii. 8, and often (comp. *Gesenius*, ii. p. 29); the formula כֹּה אָמַר, lxi. 6, lxii. 4, comp. iv. 3, xix. 18; the parenthetical יְהוָה אָמַר, for the perfect אָמַר (comp. *Kleinert*, pp. 239–250); אָבִיר, of God, xlix. 26, lx. 16, comp. i. 24; the poetical צֹאצָאִים, xlii. 5, xliv. 3, xlviii. 19, lxi. 9, lxv. 23, like xxii. 24; רַהַב, of Egypt, li. 9, like xxx. 7; גֵּזַע, "trunk of a tree," xl. 24, as xi. 1; חָרוּץ, "threshing machine," xli. 15, and xxviii. 27; יִבְלֵי מַיִם, xliv. 4, and xxx. 25; נַעֲצוּץ, only lv. 13 and vii. 19; מֵאָז, xliv. 8, xlv. 21, xlviii. 3, 5, 7, like xvi. 13; the combination רָם וְנִשָּׂא, lvii. 15, like ii. 12 [a little different], vi. 1; נָשַׁת, of water drying up, xli. 17 and xix. 5; הָיָה לְבָעַר, xliv. 15, like v. 5, vi. 13; שֹׂרֵשׂ, liii. 2, like xi. 10; and others besides. Comp. *Kleinert*, pp. 220–279.

(8) The argument from Jer. xxvi., in which the defenders of Jeremiah appeal to Mic. iii. 12 and not to these prophecies, at once loses all significance, when we reflect that Isaiah never prophesied the destruction of Jerusalem in general with words so plain and strong as Micah's; in these chapters it is only the rebuilding and glorifica-

tion of Jerusalem that he announces. For the rest, Jeremiah's acquaintance with these prophecies is shown by his thorough-going use of them, for instance in ch. x., where the powerlessness of the heathen idols is depicted entirely in words of Isaiah's. See the passages in *Movers*, de utriusque recens. vaticc. Jerem. p. 44. Comp. further Jer. xlviii. 18–22, 26, with Isa. xlvii. 1–3; Jer. xii. 14 [9?] with Isa. lvi. 9; Jer. v. 25 with Isa. lix. 1, 2; Jer. xiii. 16 with Isa. lix. 9–11; Jer. xxv. 31, 33, with Isa. lxvi. 16; Jer. l. 2 [and 8?] with Isa. xlviii. 20, lii. 11; Jer. li. 30 with Isa. xlv. 2; Jer. li. 48 with Isa. xliv. 23; Jer. li. 55, 56, with Isa. lxvi. 6; and others. Comp. *Küper*, Jerem. p. 134 sqq.; and *Caspari* in *Rudelbach* and *Guericke's* Zeitschrift, 1843, ii. 2, and 48 ff.—Ezekiel also knew these prophecies: comp. Ezek. xxiii. 40, 41, with Isa. lvii. 9; Ezek. xxxiv. with Isa. lvii. [lvi.?] 9 ff. And so Zephaniah, who has taken ch. ii. 15 word for word from Isa. xlvii. 8; and compare further Zeph. iii. 10 with Isa. lxvi. 19, 20; and *Küper*, pp. 137–8. And Habakkuk depicts idolatry undeniably after the pattern of Isa. xliv. 19, 20. Further, comp. *Delitzsch* on *Drechsler*, iii. p. 404 ff.

(9) If the prophecy, Isa. xl.–lxvi., were not by Isaiah, its reception into the book of Isaiah is an inconceivable riddle, from which we cannot escape, either by the fiction of a second Isaiah the son of Amoz, or by making our appeal to chance. Comp. *Häv.* p. 175.

(10) Already the edict of Cyrus, Ezra i. 1–4, can be explained only by the influence which these prophecies exercised upon Cyrus, according to *Josephus*, Antiq. xi. 1. Comp. *Kleinert*, p. 134 ff.; and *Häv.*, neue krit. Untersuchungen üb. d. B. Daniel, p. 80 ff. Jesus the son of Sirach also testifies to their genuineness, ch. xlviii. 22–25; and the New Testament names Isaiah as the author, as often as passages are quoted from these chapters. Comp. *Kleinert*, pp. 156–170.

§ 72. *Origin of the Book of the Prophecies of Isaiah.*

We have seen that the book of Isaiah neither contains an arbitrarily formed conglomerate of genuine and spurious pieces, predictions by various prophets at widely distant times, nor exhibits an arrangement of the individual discourses and elements that is confused and without a plan: but that the entire collection is pervaded by an organic principle corresponding to the gradual unfolding of Isaiah's prophetic agency (comp. § 65); and that the book, in its present shape, enables us to recognise it as produced by a single effort, without anything that can be shown to be a later addition or interpolation.

Then without any doubt we have to attribute the editing of his work to Isaiah himself, and to regard it as the last act of his prophetic labours before he died (1).

The opinion has sprung up in recent times, that the collection did not proceed from the prophet himself; and that only long after his age it was formed out of various smaller collections, partly Isaiah's own, partly private ones which were arranged by later hands, the whole being brought into existence rather accidentally than according to one definite plan. This opinion, however, is connected with the untenable assumption, that a great part of the oracles which are brought together in the book are spurious; and it can make no pretensions to truth and validity, simply for this additional reason, that from the first it renounces any attempt to show a principle pervading and governing the arrangement of the whole collection (2).

(1) So *Drechsler*, i. pp. 38–9; and this is approved by *Delitzsch*, iii. p. 395. The grounds for hesitation suggested by *Kleinert*, p. 110 ff., against this view proceed from false assumptions. Even the section ch. xxxvi.–xxxix. cannot be shown to be a later addition, which carries us beyond the death of Isaiah (comp. § 70).

(2) None of the opponents of the genuineness of the entire book of Isaiah can avoid assuming that there was an original collection which proceeded from the prophet's own hand: comp., for instance, *Gesenius*, i. p. 20; *Hitzig*, p. xxxvii.; *Ewald*, i. p. 177 ff.; *Knobel*, p. xxxi. But this makes an absolute riddle of their hypothesis, that the form of this original collection became altered into that of our present book of Isaiah, when a great number of heterogeneous elements came to be inserted in it and attached to it. And it pronounces sentence of death upon itself, when it assures us that "an unfortunate destiny has borne rule over this collection, more than over all the other prophetic works;" and that criticism "has not to meddle with the question, how and why these pieces, which even exceed the genuine pieces in extent, should have been arranged precisely alongside of those of Isaiah." (*Gesenius*, p. 15 ff.)

JEREMIAH (יִרְמְיָה).

Commentaries:—*Casp. Sanctius, Maldonatus, Bugenhagen, Brentius, Selneccer, Seb. Schmidt.*—*Zwingli, Œcolampadius, Calvin, Piscator, Coccejus, Clericus, Venema, Rosenmüller, Maurer*, see § 224 sq. *J. D. Michaelis*, Observatt. philol. et crit. in Jerem. vaticinia et Thren.

Ed. J. F. Schleusner, Gottingæ 1793, 4to.—*Chr. Fr. Schnurrer*, Observatt. ad vatic. Jerem. 4 Dissert., Tubingæ 1793–97, 4to, in Commentatt. theol. ed. *Velthusen*, al., vol. iii.—*Hensler*, Bemerkk. über Stellen in Jerem. Weissagg., Leipzig 1805.—*Gaab*, Erklärung schweren Stellen in d. Weissagg. Jerem., Tübingen 1824.—*J. G. Dahler*, Jerémie traduit sur le texte orig. accomp. de notes explicatives, hist. et crit., Strasbourg 1825, 1830, 2 vols.—*F. Hitzig*, d. Proph. Jeremia erklärt, Leipzig 1841 (Lieferung 3 des kurzgefasst. exeget. Handbuchs).—*Umbreit*, pract. comment. üb. den Jerem. mit exeg. u. krit. Anmerkk., Hamburg 1842.—*Wilh. Neumann*, Jeremias v. Anathoth, die Weissagg. u. Klagelieder des Proph. nach dem masor. Text ausgelegt, 1 Band, Leipzig 1856 [2 Band, 1858.—*Eb. Henderson, D.D.*, Jeremiah and Lamentations, London 1851].

For Introduction:—*Aug. Kueper*, Jeremias librorum sacr. interpres atque vindex, Berolini 1837.—De utriusque recensionis vaticiniorum Jeremiæ, Græcæ Alexandr. et Hebraice Masoreth., indole et origine. Commentat. crit. Scripsit *Franc. Car. Movers*. Hamburg 1837, 4to. —*J. L. Kœnig*, Alttestl. Studien, ii. Heft (Deuteronomy and Jeremiah), Berlin 1839.—*C. W. Ed. Nägelsbach*, der Prophet Jeremias u. Babylon. Eine exeg. krit. Abhandl., Erlangen 1850.—[*Joannis Wichelhaus*, de Jeremiæ versione Alexandria, Halis Sax. 1847.]

§ 73. *The Person of the Prophet.*

Jeremiah (יִרְמְיָהוּ) [yet also יִרְמְיָה in the title of the book, in the title at xxvii. 1, and also in xxviii. 5, 6, 10, 11, 12, 15, xxix. 1, and in Dan. ix. 2, *Bleek*, p. 469], son of Hilkiah, a priest, who came from Anathoth (i. 1) (1), was called to be a prophet in the thirteenth year of Josiah (i. 2, xxv. 3), whilst still a youth (i. 6, 7). He prophesied under the kings Josiah, Jehoiakim, Jehoiachin, and Zedekiah, till the kingdom was overthrown (i. 3), in Jerusalem, especially in the temple; then after the destruction of Jerusalem, in Judah; and finally, in Egypt, among his countrymen who had fled thither (ch. xl.–xliv.).

(1) Not the high priest of this name, mentioned in 2 Kings xxii. and 2 Chron. xxxiv. This view was entertained, indeed, by *Clemens Alex.* (Strom. i. p. 328), *Jerome*, *Kimchi* [namely, *Joseph Kimchi*, according to *Bleek*], *Abarbanel*, and last of all by *Eichhorn*, *Von Bohlen* (Genes. p. clxvi.), *Umbreit* (Jer. p. x.). But against it there is partly the indeterminate expression מִן הַכֹּהֲנִים (Jer. i. 1), and partly the

circumstance that Anathoth was inhabited by priests of the house of Ithamar, according to 1 Kings ii. 26, whereas the high priest Hilkiah was of the race of Phinehas (1 Chron. v. 38 ff.); and in general, that he would scarcely have dwelt with his family outside Jerusalem, as Jeremiah and his family did (Jer. xxxii. 8, xxxvii. 12 ff.). Comp. *Carpzov*, p. 130 sq.; *Hitzig*, Jer. p. iii.; *Häv.* pp. 195–6; and *Neumann*, Jer. p. 16 ff. [*Bleek*, p. 470, takes the same view, and says we are not to think that Hilkiah was an uncommon name among the Jews, noticing its occurrence again at ch. xxix. 3.]

(2) That Jeremiah had already come forward in Anathoth as a prophet, and had already laboured there for some time (*Ewald*, ii. p. 1; *Neumann*, p. 25), cannot be inferred with certainty from xi. 21, xii. 5, 6. Comp. *Hengstb.* Christol. ii. p. 411.

His term of labour falls within that period in which the kingdom of Judah was hurrying with rapid steps to ruin; whilst the last season of grace (granted by the Lord if it might perchance hinder the prevalence of apostasy by means of the pious king Josiah, supported as his efforts were by the high priest Hilkiah, the prophetess Huldah, and other prophets like Zephaniah and Jeremiah) had effected no thorough and more general conversion of the corrupted people. On the contrary, after their corruption had been restrained for a short time, it burst forth again with frightful violence, and brought in the torrent of the irrepressible judgments of God (3).

(3) Comp. *Hengstb.* p. 401 ff.; *Häv.* p. 106 ff.; and *Neumann*, p. 30 ff. [*Bleek*, p. 471, rejects the opinion of *Eichhorn*, *Hitzig*, *Ewald*, *Umbreit*, and *Movers* (Zeitschrift f. Philosoph. u. kathol. Theolog., Heft 12, pp. 98–9, note), that the people from the north, whose terrible invasion is often mentioned by Jeremiah, were the Scythians, whose irruption into Western Asia, including Palestine, is said by some of these writers to have been the event which roused Jeremiah to undertake the prophetic office, and to plead with his people to repent and return to the Lord.]

A preacher of repentance and of judgment among an adulterous and perverse generation, the prophet had much to suffer from the corrupt priesthood, the false prophets, and the ungodly kings (Jehoiakim and Zedekiah); and he would have been put to death amidst persecutions and murderous assaults upon his life, or he would

have died in prison (4), had the Lord not made him "a defenced city, and an iron pillar, and brazen walls against the whole land, against the kings of Judah, against the princes thereof, against the priests thereof, and against the people of the land" (i. 18). By Nebuchadnezzar's command he was set free from imprisonment when Jerusalem was taken and destroyed (ch. xxxix.); and he preferred remaining beside the ruins of his native land to going with the conqueror to Babylon (xxxix. 11 ff., xl. 1 ff.). But when, after the flagitious murder of the governor Gedaliah, the surviving remnant defied the warning voice of the prophet and fled into Egypt, he also resolved to follow them thither [was he not rather carried down by them against his will?], that there also he might proclaim to that incorrigible generation the word of the Lord (xlii.–xliv.), until he met his death, it is uncertain when or how, after almost fifty years of faithful and unwearied labour in the Lord's service (5).

(4) According to xi. 18 ff., his fellow-citizens of Anathoth laid wait for his life. Comp. also xii. 5, 6, xv. 10, xviii. 18 ff. In ch. xx. we read of his being smitten and put in the stocks by Pashur the chief priest; in xxvi. 7 ff. of his being charged with a capital offence by the priests and false prophets, under Jehoiakim, but acquitted by the nobles; in xxxvi. 26, of Jehoiakim wishing to apprehend him and Baruch, but the Lord hid them; and under Zedekiah, of his being repeatedly thrown into prison (xxxii. 2, 3, xxxiii. 3, xxxvii. 13 ff.); and in xxxviii. 5 ff. of his being cast into a miry dungeon by the nobles, from which indeed the king arranged to bring him out, yet retaining him in custody till Nebuchadnezzar set him free at the capture of the city, xxxviii. 28, xxxix. 11 ff.

(5) According to unauthenticated legends in the Fathers [*Bleek*, p. 486, names *Tertullian*, scorpiace, p. 8; *Pseudo-Epiph.* de vitis proph., Opp. ii. 239; *Jerome* adv. Jovin. lib. ii. 19; *Isidor. Hisp.* de vita et obitu sanctor. c. 38], he was stoned in Egypt by his countrymen; and at a later time his grave was shown in Cairo. The legends about him in 2 Macc. ii. 4 ff., and elsewhere, have been collected in *Fabricii* Codex pseudepigr. Vet. Test. i. p. 1111, *Carpzov*, l.c., *Knobel*, der Prophetismus, ii. pp. 260–1, and *Neumann*, p. 67 ff.

The prophecies of Jeremiah are a true copy of his inner life. Endowed with a tender and feeling mind, he experienced the deepest

pain in consequence of the corruption of his people; yet he was unwearied in executing his commission in the strength of the Lord, as he set forth their sin before high and low, without bashfulness or fear, with the utmost decision and with the most enduring patience under shame and suffering; and also as he proclaimed the inevitable overthrow of the kingdom by the Chaldeans, and the captivity of its inhabitants in Babylon. From this idiosyncrasy of the prophet, and from the peculiar divine mission entrusted to him, must be explained the peculiar characteristics of his prophetic discourses; as also the fact that he leans upon the law and the older prophets to a greater extent than any other prophet whatever (6); and that he frequently repeats the same thoughts, images, and words, making his discourses diffuse and monotonous (7); and that he is obviously negligent of his style and language (8);—peculiarities which have been wrongly explained as defects in poetic spirit and in play of imagination, and have been regarded as indications of the decline and degeneracy of prophecy (9). But the reason for his constantly going back upon the law, and for his leaning often on the older prophets, lies rather in this, that the time was come for the speedy and certain fulfilment of the threatenings of the law, especially in Deuteronomy, and of the utterances of the older prophets; while the prophet of the Lord could not represent his divine mission and the truth of his testimony more powerfully and effectively, in opposition to the bold contempt for the law on the part of the corrupted people, and the illusions of the lying prophets, than by constantly making reference to the law and to the utterances of the more ancient men of God (10).—The monotony of the discourse, and the negligence in the diction and language, are the natural expression of a mind entirely filled with grief and pain. "One who is sad and troubled in heart, whose 'eyes do fail with tears' (Lam. ii. 11), does not adorn and decorate himself with attire and discourses" (11). That Jeremiah had no want of force and fire in his discourse is shown by his prophecies against external nations, in which his language soars to higher flights and becomes rhythmical.

(6) Comp. *A. Küper*, Jeremias, etc.; *L. König*, Alttestl. Studien, ii. p. 107 ff.; and *Caspari* in *Rudelbach* and *Guericke's* Zeitschrift, 1843, ii. p. 10 ff.

(7) Repetitions of whole passages and sentences are found in viii. 10, 12, comp. vi. 13–15; ix. 8, comp. v. 9 and 29; xi. 12, 13, comp. ii. 28; xx. 12, comp. xi. 20; xxii. 4, comp. xvii. 25; xxiii. 7, comp. xvi. 14; xxvi. 6, comp. vii. 14; xxx. 23, 24, comp. xxiii. 19, 20; xxxiii. 25, 26, comp. xxxi. 35, 36; xliii. 11, comp. xv. 2; xlvi. 28, comp. xxx. 11: of images, thoughts, and expressions, in xv. 20, comp. i. 18, 19; xxiii. 15, comp. viii. 14, ix. 14; xxv. 10, comp. xvi. 9, vii. 34; xxxii. 33, comp. vii. 24, ii. 27; xliv. 4, comp. xxxv. 15, xxix. 19, xxvi. 5, xxv. 4, vii. 25; xliv. 13, 18, comp. xlii. 16, 17, xxxviii. 2, xxxiv. 17, xxxii. 36, xxix. 17, xxvii. 13, xxi. 7, 9, xviii. 21, xv. 2, xiv. 12; xliv. 22, comp. xxvi. 3, xxv. 5, xxiii. 2, 23 [22?], xxi. 12, iv. 4; xlix. 24, comp. xxx. 6, xxii. 23, xiii. 21, vi. 24; and others. Comp. *Jahn*, appendix hermen. ii. p. 113, and *Küper*, p. 115 sqq.

(8) Already *Jerome* says in his prolog. in Jerem.: "Jeremias propheta sermone quidem apud Hebræos Isaia et Osea et quibusdam aliis prophetis videtur esse rusticior, sed sensibus par est." Comp. the various judgments of the older writers in *Carpzov*, p. 157 sqq. *Cunæus*, de republ. Hebr. iii. 7, had already rightly observed: "Jeremiæ omnis majestas posita in verborum neglectu est: adeo illum decet rustica dictio." Yet many a time also the degeneracy of the language in Jeremiah is exaggerated.

(9) Comp. for instance, *Ewald*, ii. p. 5 ff.; *De Wette*, § 220. On the contrary, *Umbreit*, p. xv. ff.

(10) See *Küper*, p. xi. sqq., *Häv.* p. 200, and *Caspari*, p. 27, note.

(11) *Hengstb.* Christol. ii. p. 411. Besides, *Ewald* himself, *ibid.*, remarks: "Jeremiah's mode of representation in writing has still much that is peculiar, and even creative, considering the lateness of the time; a rich fulness of new images, with great tenderness in the delineation, a versatility which insinuates itself into every one of the most various objects, a pictorial distinctness, and with all this an unpretending simplicity, which keeps at a distance from the far more highly esteemed artificial style of his contemporary Habakkuk."

§ 74. *Contents and Structure of the Book.*

The prophecies of Jeremiah are arranged more according to subject-matter than in the order of time. His book falls into two divisions. I. Prophecies and history relating to his own country (i.–xlv.). Under this there come—1. longer discourses, giving again in a comprehensive representation the substance of the individual prophecies relating to the Chaldean act of judgment impending over

the kingdom of Judah for its sins (i.–xxiv.): of which ch. i. contains the calling of the prophet; ch. ii.–x., the rebukes, threatenings, and promises in the time of Josiah; ch. xi.–xx., those of the time of Jehoiakim and Jehoiachin; while ch. xxi.–xxiv. belong in part to the reign of Zedekiah (1). 2. Special prophecies of the overthrow of Jerusalem and the servitude to the Chaldeans for seventy years, in the reigns of Jehoiakim and Zedekiah; which are placed together on account of the similarity of their contents and object: they are introduced by a prophecy uttered in the fourth year of Jehoiakim, which announces the judgment upon all nations (xxv.–xxix.) (2). 3. Announcements of salvation, in reference to the future redemption and glorification of Israel; belonging to the last part of Zedekiah's reign, and combined on account of their contents having so much in common (xxx.–xxxiii.) (3). 4. Shorter utterances, occasioned by particular occurrences, of which a precise narrative is given; belonging to the times of Jehoiakim and Zedekiah (xxxiv.–xxxix.) (4). 5. Historical, in reference to what the prophet did among the people left in the land by the Chaldeans after the destruction of Jerusalem, both prior to their flight into Egypt and after it (ch. xl.–xliv.); together with a word of consolation to Baruch, in the fourth year of Jehoiakim (xlv.) (5).—II. Prophecies against foreign nations. 1. Those occasioned by Nebuchadnezzar's victory over Pharaoh-Necho in the fourth year of Jehoiakim: *a.* against Egypt (xlvi.); *b.* against the Philistines (xlvii.); *c.* against Moab (xlviii.); *d.* against Ammon (xlix. 1–6); *e.* against Edom (xlix. 7–22); *f.* against Damascus (xlix. 23–27); *g.* against Kedar and Hazor (xlix. 28–33). 2. Utterance against Elam, in the beginning of the reign of Zedekiah (xlix. 34–39). 3. Prophecy against Babylon (l. and li.), in the fourth year of Zedekiah (li. 59–64) (6). —The entire collection concludes with a historical appendix containing accounts of the destruction of Jerusalem [etc.], ch. lii.

(1) The opinion of *Hitzig* and *Ewald*, that ch. i. is a reflection upon his work hitherto, attached by the prophet after the destruction of Jerusalem, rests upon erroneous views of the nature of prophecy: against it, comp. *Häv.* p. 208. Nor yet do the remaining pieces in this first section contain individual discourses, as the prophet actually spoke them at different times, but a *resumé* of the whole of his active efforts as a prophet throughout this period. Ch. ii. 1–iii. 5 is a shorter, and

ch. iii. 6–vi. 30 is a more enlarged "collection of whatever, independently of reference to particular circumstances at the time, was in general destined to give internal support to Josiah's external reforming activity" (*Hengstb.* Christol. ii. p. 413; *Häv.* p. 210 f.; *Neumann*, p. 160 ff.). Ch. vii.–x. contain a similar composition, which beats down the false confidence of the people in the temple, and announces the coming judgment in all its fearfulness. Against the attempts of various critics to separate individual parts of this section from the whole, and to place them in the time of Jehoiakim, see *Häv.* p. 211, *Neumann*, p. 419 ff.—Ch. xi.–xiii. contain the rebuke of the people for covenant-breaking, and its consequences; ch. xiv. and xv., the prophecy of the drought: in ch. xvi. and xvii. the rescue of the stiff-necked people is shown to be impossible; and in ch. xviii.–xx. their incorrigibility is shown, and the necessity for the judgment is confirmed by several emblems. In these chapters, too, we see that it is impossible to carry out the attempts of *Eichhorn*, *Dahler*, *Hitzig*, and others, to dismember them into individual discourses, uttered at determinate times under this or that king: comp. *Häv.* p. 213 f.—Ch. xxi.–xxiv. give the announcement of the overthrow of Jerusalem and the people (xxi.); furnish the reason for this, by depicting the corruption of the shepherds, the ungodly secular and spiritual leaders of the nation, kings and princes, prophets and priests (xxii. xxiii.); and give the confirmation of it, by communicating an earlier vision of the condition of the kingdom (xxiv.). Although this prophecy proceeds from the time of the siege of Jerusalem in Zedekiah's reign (xxi. 1), still, in depicting the corruption of the leaders of the people, everything is comprehended which Jeremiah had ever uttered on the subject; and to the whole there is annexed a vision in the beginning of Zedekiah's reign (xxiv. 1), which represents the respective fortunes of the people who were carried away along with Jehoiachin, and of those who were left behind (comp. *Ewald*, ii. pp. 98–9). [The arrangement of the prophecies of Jeremiah is confessedly very difficult. *Nägelsbach*, in *Herzog's* Encycl., still clings to the chronological arrangement; assigning ch. ii.–vi. to the reign of Josiah, ch. vii.–xiii. to the reigns of Jehoiakim and Jehoiachin, and ch. xiv.–xx. to the reign of Zedekiah. *Bleek*, p. 472 ff., is inclined to place under Josiah not only ch. i. and iii. 6–vi. 30, but also ii. 1–iii. 5, vii. 1–ix. 25, xi. 1–17, and perhaps more which cannot be determined. Written in the reign of Jehoiakim, in addition to those which are dated, he thinks probably xvi. 1–xvii. 18; xvii. 19–27; xiv. xv.; xviii.; xi. 18–xii. 17. Perhaps under Jehoiachin should be placed x. 17–25, xiii. To Zedekiah's reign he would perhaps assign x. 1–16, as a letter to the

exiles; also the peculiarly dated chapters xxvii. xxviii.; also xxii. 1–xxiii. 8, xxiii. 9–40; and probably xix. xx., besides those that are dated.—*Neumann* abandons every attempt to arrange chronologically, and disposes the whole book under three divisions, expansions of Jeremiah's two opening visions: the almond-rod, the emblem of Israel's ideal destiny (referring to the almond-rods laid up in the tabernacle); and the seething pot, indicating impending judgments; and a transitional passage.—*First*, The almond-rod. First group of discourses, ch. ii.–vi.: A. Israel's infidelity (ii. 1–iii. 5); B. the call to repentance (iii. 6–iv. 4); C. the judgment upon the impenitent (iv. 5–vi. 30). Second group, ch. vii.–xvii.: D. Israel's persistence in infidelity (vii. 1–x. 25); E. the curse of covenant-breaking (xi.); F. Jehovah's hatred of His people (xii.–xvii.).—*Second*, The signs of rejection, ch. xviii. xix.: the potter, and the potter's vessel broken.—*Third*, The seething pot. First group, before the fall of Jerusalem, ch. xx.–xxxviii.: 1. Jeremiah's sufferings (xx.); 2. subjection under Nebuchadnezzar's power (xxi.); 3. the shepherds of God's people (xxii. xxiii.); 4. the captivity in Babylon, the emblem of it, the cup of wrath, the certainty of the coming misery, its duration, and its removal by redemption and other Messianic blessings (xxiv.–xxxiii.); 5. Israel's disobedience, as the judgment is about to break out (xxxiv. xxxv.); 6. Jeremiah's prophecy, a testimony against disobedience (xxxvi.); 7. the prophet's fate, as a testimony that the people are reprobate (xxxvii. xxxviii.). Second group: the conquest of Jerusalem, ch. xxxix. Third group, after the destruction of the city, ch. xl.–xliv.: 1. Gedaliah (xl.); 2. Ishmael (xli.); 3. warnings against fleeing into Egypt (xlii.); 4. the flight (xliii.); 5. Jehovah's curse upon the fugitives (xliv.). Fourth group: Baruch, the remnant of the rescued, ch. xlv. In his arrangement of the prophecies against foreign nations, where there is scarcely any room for variety of treatment, he counts *ten* objects of the prophet's predictions, by reckoning Kedar and Hazor as two, although they are conjoined in one prophetic utterance.]

(2) Ch. xxv. belongs to the fourth year of Jehoiakim (comp. xxv. 1); on the contrary, ch. xxvi. to the beginning of this king's reign (comp. xxvi. 1): yet that chapter takes precedence, because it announces the judgment to all nations in more comprehensive generality. [The phrase "beginning of the reign" of Jehoiakim may, however, quite well indicate the fourth year: observe how these two are conjoined in ch. xxviii. 1, with reference to Zedekiah.] Ch. xxvii. and xxviii. contain four discourses, connected by their subject-matter: (*a*) against various foreign kings (xxvii. 1–11); (*b*) against Zedekiah (vers. 12–15); (*c*) against the priests and the people (vers. 16–22);

(*d*) against a false prophet (xxviii.). And ch. xxix. is an epistle to those who were carried captive along with Jehoiachin; together with an utterance, intimately connected with it, against the false prophet Shemaiah.

(3) In ch. xxxii. and xxxiii. the prophet foretells the taking and burning of Jerusalem, yet immediately afterwards the redemption of Israel and Judah, and the glorification of the theocracy; and this he does both symbolically and literally: the prophecy is dated the eighth year of Zedekiah, during the siege of Jerusalem. Chronologically these chapters precede the lofty and comprehensive announcements of salvation for Israel and Judah in ch. xxx. xxxi.; which, so far as we can judge from the superscription in xxxi. 1–3, were not uttered publicly in that form in which they lie before us, but were composed in a written form only, in accordance with revelations earlier received, for the benefit of contemporaries and of posterity. The place of precedence granted to ch. xxx. and xxxi. is not to be explained, with *Hitzig*, p. 241, by the existence of ch. xxxii. and xxxiii. in a written form already when the command in xxx. 2 was issued (against this, comp. *Häv.* p. 218): the explanation, as in the case of ch. xxv. placed before ch. xxvi., is that its contents are more general and comprehensive..

(4) These shorter utterances, too, with their historical setting, are arranged according to the principle of connection in the subject-matter. First comes the utterance as to Zedekiah's destiny, xxxiv. 1–7, which is briefly mentioned, by way of an introduction, at ch. xxxii. 3, 4; and next to this is placed the prophecy, spoken about the same time, on occasion of the bond-servants being taken back who had been set at liberty, vers. 8–22. As these two pieces announce that Jersualem under Zedekiah should be taken by the Chaldeans, there are given next at this point ch. xxxv. and xxxvi., which contain events and utterances of the time of the first conquest of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar, under Jehoiakim; upon which ch. xxxvii.–xxxix. follow, communicating additional notices of Jeremiah's life and work under Zedekiah.

(5) This section attaches itself to the preceding one, in the order of matter as well as in that of time. The word of consolation to Baruch (xlv.) forms, not the introduction to the prophecies against the nations, ch. xlvi.–li. (*Häv.* p. 219), but the conclusion of the domestic prophecies. It is not placed just after ch. xxxvi., where chronologically it should be found, but at the end of the first part; because beside ch. xxxvi. it would have disturbed the order of the subject-matter.

(6) The prophecies against the foreign nations, ch. xlvi.–li., simply carry out further the judgment announced to all nations in ch. xxv.;

and for the most part they proceed from the same time (comp. xlvi. 2 with xxv. 1). Nevertheless they neither stood just after ch. xxv. in the original collection, nor yet do they belong to it; for ch. xxv. does not form the introduction to them, but has the theocracy itself and its fortunes for its centre and immediate object. The transposition in the Septuagint is a wilful alteration of the original order.

§ 75. *Genuineness and Integrity of Jeremiah's Prophecies.*

As Jeremiah's prophecies bear very distinctly the stamp of this prophet's strongly marked and easily recognised individuality, their genuineness has generally remained unassailed. It has been only in the most recent times that the integrity and genuineness of the following single passages have been disputed.

I. Ch. x. 1–16 is said to contain interpolated additions in the Masoretic text, which are wanting in the Septuagint (vers. 6, 7, 8, 10); and besides, the whole is said to be the work of the pseudo-Isaiah, since the warning against heathenish divination and idolatry, vers. 2–5, and the Chaldee of ver. 11, betray a writer who lived in the exile, and also the style is that of the pseudo-Isaiah (1). On the contrary, this section at once manifests itself to be genuine, because it merely gives the proofs which establish what Jeremiah had said, ch. ix. 22–25 [English version, vers. 23–26], of Israel's glory, and of its being placed on the same footing as the uncircumcised heathen. The discourse is not at all about the astrology of the Chaldeans, but solely the deeper foundation of their idolatry which is discovered to the people; and along with this, the necessity on God's part for scattering them among the heathen (ix. 15) is shown to them (2).—The style of these verses certainly reminds one of the last part of Isaiah (3): but this is sufficiently explained by Jeremiah's characteristic practice of attaching himself to the utterances of the older prophets (§ 73, Note 6); and when combined with the ideas and expressions which are peculiar to him, not only in vers. 6–8, 10, which on insufficient grounds are said to be later interpolations, but also in other verses, they furnish a striking proof in favour of the genuineness of the assailed passage (4).

(1) So *De Wette*, § 217, *c*, following *Movers*, de utr. recens. Jer. p. 43, and *Hitzig*, p. 81 ff.—On the contrary, the genuineness has

been defended by *Küper*, p. 175 sq., *Umbreit*, pp. 83–4, *Häv.* p. 222 ff., and *Welte* on *Herbst's* Einleit. ii. 2, p. 61.

(2) Comp. *Neumann* on the place.—Somewhat differently *Häv.* pp. 223–4, with *J. H. Michaelis*, *Umbreit*, and others. Also the rejection of ver. 11 as an interpolation, by *Houbigant*, *Venema*, *Rosenmüller*, and *Maurer*, is a violent stroke of criticism.

(3) See them in juxtaposition in *Küper*, i. c. p. 134 sq.

(4) Comp. הֶבֶל, of the idols, vers. 3, 15, with ii. 5; אוֹתָם for אֹתָם, ver. 5; and בְּעֵת פָּקְדָתָם, ver. 15, with viii. 12, vi. 15, xlix. 8, xi. 23 [all but the first a little varied].—The expedient resorted to by *Ewald*, ii. p. 63, and *Umbreit*, p. 83, saying that the pseudo-Isaiah imitated our prophet, is merely a consequence of the false assumption that the last part of Isaiah is spurious; and it is to be rejected equally with the assertion of *Movers*, *Hitzig*, and *De Wette*, that vers. 6–8, 10, are later interpolations,—an assertion which is in no way justified by the omission of these verses in the Septuagint, considering the thoroughly arbitrary conduct of these translators. Comp. *Häv.* pp. 224–5.

II. Later interpolations are said to be found in ch. xxv., vers. 11*b*–14*a*; in ch. xxvii., vers. 7, 16–21; in ch. xxxiii., vers. 14–26; in ch. xxxix., vers. 1, 2, 4–13: and besides, ch. xxvii.–xxix., xxx.–xxxiii. have been retouched in various places by a later hand (5). But in ch. xxv. 11–14, offence is taken chiefly at the prophecy of the seventy years' duration of the Chaldean servitude being too definite; and in accordance with dogmatic prejudices, this is held to be a *vaticinium ex eventu* (6). It is just so with ch. xxvii. 7, a verse omitted by the Septuagint, because not suiting the opinion which this translator had previously embraced as to the duration of the exile. Again, in xxvii. 16–21, the circumstance that the Septuagint altered the utterance of the prophet in accordance with the legends prevailing among the Alexandrians, can furnish no solid reason for admitting interpolations (7). Next, the rejection of xxxiii. 14–26 as spurious, by the Septuagint and the recent critics, is connected with a crude literal apprehension of the passage; as the rejection of xxxix. 1, 2, 4–13 is connected with imaginary historical inaccuracies, the burden of which falls not upon the text, but only on some of its expositors (8). Finally, the retouching of ch. xxvii.–xxix. is inferred partly from the shorter form of the proper names, יִרְמְיָה, צִדְקִיָּה, יְכָנְיָה, and others; and partly from the predicate הַנָּבִיא often subjoined to the name of the prophet (xxviii.

5, 6, 10–12, 15, xxix. 1). This latter argument is urged without considering that the contents and the tendency of these chapters demand the use of this predicate, in order to designate Jeremiah, in opposition to the false prophets, as the sole rightful owner of the official name "prophet." And the argument from the forms of the proper names adduced immediately loses all its importance when we take notice that they may proceed from the author, and are not once used constantly, but are interchanged with the fuller form, and this not in these chapters only, but in all Jeremiah, and generally in all writers of the middle and the later age (9).—For the retouching of ch. xxx.–xxxiii., weight is attached to "the style of the pseudo-Isaiah." This however ignores, instead of refuting, the explanation, which is not far to seek; namely, that when these chapters lean upon Isaiah, and accord with it, this is due to Jeremiah's reading and using the prophecies of Isaiah, as he did in other instances (10).

(5) Comp. *Movers*, p. 26 sqq. v. and 38 sqq.; *Hitzig*, pp. 193 ff., 212 ff., 219 ff., 227 ff., 238 ff., and elsewhere; *De Wette*, § 217, *a* and *b*. [*Bleek*, p. 491, agrees with the Septuagint in rejecting xxix. 16–20; at p. 493 he reckons the Septuagint the better text of ch. xxv. generally.] Against this, see *Häv.* p. 225 ff.

(6) See *Hitzig*, pp. 194–5, and the refutation in *Häv.* pp. 226–7, and *Umbreit*, p. 169.—Ver. 13 itself, which was held to be spurious so early as by *Venema*, *Schnurrer*, and others, is neither interpolated nor spurious. For even though in the fourth year of Jehoiakim there were not yet in existence any book of Jeremiah's with prophecies against all the nations (and this cannot at least be proved from Jer. xxxvi. 1); still there is nothing of importance to prevent our adopting the opinion, that Jeremiah did not write down the prophecy in ch. xxv. till a later time, and that he added the reference to this book of his prophecies at the time he so wrote these prophecies down, or at the time he edited them.

(7) Comp. *Häv.* pp. 228–9.

(8) See in *Hengstb.* Christol. ii. p. 513 f., the right interpretation of xxxiii. 14–26, with a defence of its genuineness against *J. D. Michaelis* and *Jahn*. Comp. also *Umbreit*, p. 211, and the refutation of the objections to ch. xxxix. in *Häv.* pp. 232–3. [Owing to the omission in the Septuagint, *Bleek*, p. 492, thinks xxxii. 14–26 is either not genuine, or not in its proper place; and pp. 491–2 he pronounces xxxix. 4–13 spurious.]

(9) Comp. xxvii. 1 with xxviii. 5; xxvii. 3 with ver. 12; xxviii. 11 with ver. 12, xxix. 30, and others besides; and on the whole subject, see *Küper, l.c.* p. 201. [See also the refutation of a similar argument about *Jehoash* and *Joash* at § 57, Note 7.]

(10) See the affinity of thoughts and expressions to those of Isaiah, and the borrowing from him, in *Küper*, p. 149 sq., and *Caspari, ib.* p. 48 ff.; also see the refutation of *Movers'* criticism in *Küper*, p. 171 sqq. How arbitrary and groundless this criticism is, is proved at once by the great difference of opinion between *Movers* and *Hitzig* as to the alleged interpolations. On this, comp. *Häv.* pp. 231–2.

III. Ch. xlviii. is said not only to be interpolated by the pseudo-Isaiah, but also to be enriched by additions from the pen of a second elaborator. But the alleged want of acquaintance with historical and geographical circumstances, and also with the Hebrew language, which are the proofs of these interpolations, is an unfounded charge made by a criticism almost blinded by prejudice [these geographical details, on the contrary, being regarded as of the highest value by recent explorers in the land of Moab, which is still very imperfectly known]; and there is no other reason than this for the pretended interpolations, that Jeremiah has taken up anew the prophecies of Balaam and Isaiah against Moab, and has freely wrought them up anew, and reproduced them (11).

(11) See more precise details in *Küper*, p. 83 sqq.; *Umbreit* and *Ewald* on Jer. xlviii.; also see the refutation of *Hitzig's* reasoning in *Häv.* p. 233 ff.

IV. The prophecy against Babylon, ch. l. and li., is said to be either spurious or interpolated by the pseudo-Isaiah (12), and this on account of—

(*a.*) "The many repetitions, in which Jeremiah's own peeps through only at individual places, *although these are pretty numerous*; and the repeated passages are often entirely wrought up afresh and altered." Yet "as Jeremiah is not unfrequently accustomed to repeat himself elsewhere," this fact can only excite "a presumption in favour of this prophecy being his own composition." And it will do so all the more that the assertion is added without proof, that Jeremiah, on the whole, repeats himself more, and is not untrue to himself: on the contrary,

the same freedom and independence in the use of earlier utterances are manifested here, which are elsewhere a distinguishing mark of Jeremiah; and further, in general, all these repetitions of older utterances are suitable, and are applied with wise consideration (13).

(*b.*) "The new thoughts and words, entirely foreign to Jeremiah, which point to a later age,—Babylon already conquered by Cyrus, although unexpectedly spared instead of being destroyed,—a kingdom entirely degenerate, and no longer able to resist its final destruction, —the prophet's impetuous rebellion against the Chaldean tyrants, and the public summons to all the brethren living in Babylon to flee from the city which is irretrievably lost, and to return to the Holy Land, —the designation, without any disguise, of the Medes and other northern nations, as the deadly enemies of Babylon;—in Jeremiah all this is strange, contradictory, yea impossible."—Strong assertions, wanting nothing except proof. Of the destruction of Babylon already accomplished by Cyrus, the oracle knows nothing; but it depicts this as still impending (14).—The impetuous revolt against the Chaldean tyrants, and the summons to the exiles to leave Babylon (l. 8, 14 ff., li. 6, 45, etc.), only prove that the prophet was no mere common philanthropist speaking in accordance with subjective fancies, but a prophet of the true God, who recognised enmity to the kingdom of God in the tyranny of Babylon, and who represented its ruin as an act of divine justice, yet free from the zeal of passion, simply because Babylon was the arch-enemy of the kingdom of God, the redemption of which demanded the annihilation of its enemies (15). The designation of the Medes as the principal enemies of Babylon, speaks, not *against* Jeremiah's claim to be the author, but *in favour* of it; for a poet living after Cyrus took Babylon would have named the Persians, according to the standing designation of Cyrus, by the writers after the exile, as king of Persia (2 Chron. xxxvi. 22; Ezra i. 1, 2, iv. 5, etc.).

(*c.*) "The play upon words in the names שֵׁשַׁךְ for בָּבֶל, li. 44; לֵב קָמַי, 'heart of those that rise up against me,' for כַּשְׂדִּים, li. 1; and similar paraphrases of Chaldean names for a like purpose, in l. 21." But Jeremiah is partial to precisely this play upon words (comp. xx. 3) (16); and already, at xxv. 26, he names Babylon "Sheshach," where it is entirely arbitrary to set the word aside by assuming that it is interpolated (17).

(*d.*) "Altogether new words, peculiar to later writers, not earlier than Ezekiel like סָנָן, פְּחָה (li. 23, 28, 57); גִּלּוּלִים (l. 2), בְּדִים, 'false prophets' (l. 36); הֶחָרִים, 'put to the ban' (l. 21, 26, li. 3, also xxv. 9)." Now, as for this last word, ch. xxv. is at once perfectly sufficient to justify it as a word of Jeremiah's; בְּדִים is from Jer. xliv. 25; גִּלּוּלִים is from Lev. xxvi. 30, Deut. xxix. 16; and the remaining words, adopted from the Babylonians, might be just as well known to Jeremiah as to his younger contemporary Ezekiel.

(*e.*) "The great affinity of l. 27, li. 40 to Isa. xxxiv. 6 ff.,—that of l. 39 to Isa. xxxiv. 14,—and that of li. 60 ff. to Isa. xxxiv. 16,"—do certainly exist; yet neither have they come into these prophecies by later interpolation, nor do they prove that the two passages have the same author, or that both are spurious. But the explanation is simply this, that Jeremiah had read the prophecy of Isaiah (ch. xxxiv.), and taken these thoughts, images, and expressions from it (18).—As the result of the whole, Jeremiah not only may be, he actually is, the author of this prophecy. For it is universally confessed, not only that many words, turns of expression, and thoughts, are manifestly Jeremiah's, but also that the whole arrangement is common with Jeremiah: besides, at the commencement, our prophet is named as the author, and the date of its publication is given (l. 1); and this is confirmed by the epilogue, which carries with it the peculiar colouring of Jeremiah's symbolism (li. 59–64) (19).

(12) The genuineness has been assailed by *Eichhorn*, Einl. iv. p. 210 ff. (Hebr. Proph. iii. p. 255 ff.); *v. Cölln*, in the Allgem. Litter. Zeitung, Erg. Bl. 1828, xvi. 118; *Gramberg*, krit. Geschichte d. Religionsideen, ii. p. 396 ff.; *Maurer*, Comm. i. p. 682 sqq.; *Knobel*, der Prophetismus, ii. p. 353 ff.; *Ewald*, ii. p. 491 ff.; *Herzfeld*, Geschichte, i. pp. 284–5. On the contrary, it is defended by *Küper*, p. 106 ff., *Umbreit*, p. 290 ff., and *Häv.* p. 236 ff. [also by *Bleek*, p. 479 f., who says that if we pronounce it spurious, we must, with *Ewald*, think of a later author deliberately writing in the name of Jeremiah]: also by *Nägelsbach*, d. Proph. Jer., etc.; *Movers*, *l.c.* p. 44 sqq.; *Hitzig*, pp. 390-1; and *De Wette*, Einl. § 217*a* (in editions 5–7); who, however, deny the integrity of the prophecy, and affirm that there are many re-touchings and interpolations.

(13) Comp. *Küper*, p. 113 sqq.

(14) Comp. l. 3, 8, 9, 14–16, 18, 21, 26, 29, 34, 35, 41–46, li.

1 ff., and other passages; which leave so little doubt as to the meaning of the perfect tense, "Babylon is taken" (l. 2), and similar words uttered from the ideal point of view for prophetic intuition, that, for instance, this perfect is expressly explained by the future in ver. 9.

(15) Comp. *Häv.* pp. 242–3.

(16) See the changes in names, with a play upon their meaning, in xxii. 11, 24, 28; and on these, *Hengstb.* Christol. ii. p. 444 ff.

(17) [*Bleek*, p. 493, pronounces Sheshach an interpolation in both cases, rejecting xxv. 26*b* as spurious, and in li. 1 reading always פְּקֹדִים with the Septuagint.] Still more arbitrary seems to be the demand of *Nägelsbach*, p. 134, that we should prove the discovery of Athbash [the name given by later Jewish writers to that particular play upon words which is supposed to be involved in these two expressions, reversing the order of the alphabet, so that Aleph stood for Tau, Beth for Shin, etc.] had already taken place in Jeremiah's time. The proof of this would lie simply in the fact that Jeremiah had made use of it; and he who should deny this fact would require to prove that the discovery could not have been so ancient as to proceed from Jeremiah. But a mere negation is not a proof.

(18) Comp. particularly *Caspari* in *Rudelbach* and *Guericke's* Zeitschrift, 1843, ii. p. 1 ff.; and *Küper*, p. 124 sqq.

(19) In fact, this prophecy exhibits numerous traces and proofs of its genuineness. *Usus loquendi* (l. 16, li. 1, 3, 7, 14, 45, 55), and the circle of imagery (li. 7, 8, 34, 37), as also the style (l. 2, 3, 7, 10), especially in turns like li. 2, betray Jeremiah unmistakeably. Chronological data confirm this result. "Assyria is fallen (l. 18); but Jerusalem is still inhabited, and the present king of Babylon is still Nebuchadnezzar (l. 17). Thus the oracle suits the time after the captivity of Jehoiachin, and before the final catastrophe; that is, the period of Zedekiah" (*Hitzig*, p. 391). But the reasons with which *Hitzig* and *Movers* and *De Wette* wish to prove that there are interpolations, are refuted by *Umbreit*, pp. 292–3, and *Häv.* p. 244 ff.; partially also by *Nägelsbach*, though he himself holds that l. 41–46, li. 15–19, 41, are later interpolations.

V. Ch. lii., to which 2 Kings xxiv. 18–xxv. 30 presents a parallel for the most part agreeing word for word, is a historical appendix to the prophecies of Jeremiah, which end at li. 64. It is not taken from the second book of Kings: since in that passage there is nothing answering to vers. 28–30 here; and also because vers. 19–23 give information which is much more copious and precise than that in

2 Kings xxv. 15–17 (20). Yet neither can it have been composed originally by Jeremiah, and subjoined to the collection of his prophetic discourses, and then admitted from this into the books of Kings, —partly on account of the information in vers. 31–34 as to facts which Jeremiah can scarcely have lived to see, partly on account of the incompleteness of the information communicated here in reference to the overthrow of the kingdom (21). Ch. lii. much more probably contains an extract made by the collector of the prophecies from a detailed account of the last times of the kingdom of Judah (the author of which may have been either Jeremiah or Baruch); this being intended as a voucher for the fulfilment of Jeremiah's predictions as to the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple, and the carrying of the people captive to Babylon (22).

(20) This is the view adopted by *Grotius*, *Rosenmüller*, *Maurer*, *Bertholdt*, *Herbst*, and *De Wette*. [One of the reasons would fall away, however, if we could look on vers. 28–30 as a later addition, as *Bleek*, p. 492, inclines to do: partly because the Septuagint omits them; partly on account of a difference in their chronology, placing a deportation in the 18th year of Nebuchadnezzar, which he identifies with that at the time the city was taken, the 19th year, ver. 12.]

(21) *Häv.* ii. 1, p. 172, and ii. 2, pp. 248–9, still declares in favour of this, following *Seb. Schmidt* and *Carpzov*, p. 137.

(22) Comp. my Commentary on Kings, p. 606 ff.; also *Jahn*, Einl. ii. 2, p. 565; and *Ewald*, p. 22, according to whom the extract has been taken from the histories of the kingdom.

In reference to the integrity of the Masoretic recension of the text generally, comp. further § 175 and § 284, ii.

§ 76. *Origin of the Book of the Prophecies of Jeremiah.*

According to ch. xxxvi., in the fourth year of Jehoiakim's reign Jeremiah set down in writing, by the hand of Baruch, in the roll of a book, all the prophecies which he had hitherto uttered (ver. 4); and after the king had cut up and burned this roll the following year, again he wrote down all the utterances contained in it, subjoining many like words (vers. 23, 27, 28, 32; comp. also xlv. 1). We can no longer point out his collection as an element in our present book: for it contains discourses undoubtedly of the time of Zedekiah, from ch. xxi. onwards; and even its superscription, i. 1–3, referring

to the overthrow of the kingdom, proves that it could not have been made before the destruction of Jerusalem. Historical testimonies to its origin are entirely wanting; so that we have to draw conclusions from the plan and constitution of the book, as to the manner in which it came into existence (1).

(1) In this process we must set the Alexandrian version entirely aside; for the derangement of the prophecies against foreign nations in these versions, as compared with the Masoretic text, offers no proof for the existence of a peculiar Alexandrian collection and recension of the text,—it only shows that the translator has extended his arbitrary alterations (§ 175) even to the arrangement of the collection. [For convenience, the following table has been made more complete, by naming the subjects of each prophecy, and by numbering according to the two copies. It is perhaps not difficult to suggest the principle of arrangement on which the translator may have proceeded in making these unwarrantable alterations: for he has given the first three places to the three most important heathen powers which were brought into contact with Israel,—Elam standing first of all, as the great empire which had been subverted by the Macedonian empire, under one branch of which this translator lived. A similar principle of arrangement, according to the importance of the communities addressed, has been noticed in the order of the epistles in the New Testament as commonly in use, differing from the order of the most ancient copies. As for the bolder and more general change,—the transference of these prophecies against the nations from the end of the book to the middle of it,—it should be recollected that this is the position occupied by the analogous prophecies in Ezekiel: see some remarks in § 78, Note 4.]

MASORETIC (HEBREW).	SEPTUAGINT.	SUBJECT.	ORDER IN HEB.	ORDER IN SEPT.
Ch. xlix. 34-39.	Ch. xxv. 34-39.	Elam.	VIII.	1.
Ch. xlvi. 2-12.	Ch. xxvi. 1-11.	Egypt.	I.	2.
Ch. xlvi. 13-28.	Ch. xxvi. 12-26.			
Ch. l. li.	Ch. xxvii. xxviii.	Babylon.	IX.	3.
Ch. xlvii. 1-7.	Ch. xxix. 1-7.	Philistines.	II.	4.
Ch. xlix. 7-22.	Ch. xxix. 7-22.	Edom.	V.	5.
Ch. xlix. 1-6.	Ch. xxx. 1-5.	Ammon.	IV.	6.
Ch. xlix. 28-33.	Ch. xxx. 6-11.	Kedar, Hazor.	VII.	7.
Ch. xlix. 23-27.	Ch. xxx. 12-16.	Damascus.	VI.	8.
Ch. xlviii.	Ch. xxxi.	Moab.	III.	9.
Ch. xxv. 15-39 [38?].	Ch. xxxii.	The wine-cup.		
Ch. xxvi.-xlv.	Ch. xxxiii.-li.			
Ch. lii.	Ch. lii.			

The juxtaposition of the individual prophecies predominantly in the order of their subject-matter, and, still more, the comprehension of individual discourses, belonging to the reigns of Josiah, Jehoiakim, and Zedekiah, under larger prophetic addresses and groups of discourses (§ 73 [74?]), lead to the inference that Jeremiah himself had an important share in the work of collecting and arranging his book; also to this other inference, that the collection was made at a time when the prophet's active service was concluded, so that a review of it was possible from beginning to end.—The superscription in i. 1–3, and the subscription in li. 64, are in entire harmony with this representation. Although the eleventh year of Zedekiah is named in the superscription as the terminating limit, still we must not confine this statement to one portion of the collection, say ch. i.–xxxix.; but, according to the analogy of all the prophetic superscriptions, we must make it refer to the entire book. For not only are the labours of the prophet stated in the customary manner, with a reference to the kings in whose reigns they occurred, but besides, the great problem involved in these labours was finished in the eleventh year of Zedekiah, or with the overthrow of the kingdom; and thus, in that condensed superscription, it was possible to take no notice of his further labours among the ruins of the kingdom and in Egypt (ch. xl.–xliv.), because these stood in a mere subordinate relation to his principal vocation (2). —A historical supplement (ch. lii.) does follow the subscription in li. 64, yet we cannot infer that it has been subjoined by a later hand; it has been placed after the subscription by the collector, because it was to form simply an appendix to the prophecies (דִּבְרִים). However, as this appendix has not been written by Jeremiah himself, if we may judge from its contents and nature (see § 75, v.), the entire collection would thus have been finally edited, not by the prophet himself, but probably by his assistant Baruch, who had already at an earlier time written down the prophecies.—There are no valid grounds for admitting a later edition, any more than repeated transpositions of individual discourses and portions of the book, which in these our days is a favourite hypothesis (3).

(2) Comp. *Hengstb.* Beitrr. i. p. 67, and *Häv.* p. 208.

(3) According to *Movers*, p. 23 sqq., the present collection has grown out of *six* single books issued by the prophet, upon the basis

of that which Baruch wrote down (ch. xxxvi.); and this in such a manner, that the first collection of these prophecies, which had existed in various books, excepting ch. xxvii.–xxix., xxx., xxxi., xxxiii., appeared immediately after the captivity, under the care of the editor and composer of our books of Kings; then a second more complete collection by Nehemiah, which presents the Masoretic recension of the text; while, finally, a new recension of the text was undertaken in Egypt, in the time of Alexander the Great. Against this, comp. *De Wette*, § 219, *d.*—According to Hitzig, p. xii. f., when Jeremiah was planning the new collection of his oracles (xxxvi. 32), first he adopted all those which had formed the earlier collection, that is, ch. i., ii.–xii. 6, xxv., xlvi.–xlix.; and then he inserted ch. xlv., together with ch. xxvi., xxxv., xxxvi., forming a little book by themselves, behind ch. xxv. Then into this collection, at the beginning of Zedekiah's reign, were inserted, where they now are, the oracles which stand in the present book between xii. 6 and xxv., excepting the single leaf xx. 7–xxi. 10, thrown together without plan or order, just as they were; and thus a preliminary closing of the collection took place: but afterwards the sections which belong to a subsequent period were strung on as supplements,—namely, ch. xxvii.–xxix. behind xlix. 39; then ch. l. and li., the pieces xx. 7–xxi. 10, xxiv., and ch. xxxii., which Jeremiah had already combined with ch. xxx. and xxxi., so that ch. xxx.–xxxiii. constituted a book by themselves; subsequently they were inserted in what is chronologically the right place, behind ch. xl. 6, in the biographical section ch. xxxvii.–xliv., which was latest of being added, having been composed in Egypt. A collection of such a nature as this was finally reduced to the form of our present book by a final "diaskeuast," who made all sorts of transpositions and other changes (! !).—According to *Ewald*, ii. p. 15 ff., Jeremiah edited the principal portion of our present book in the period between the destruction of Jerusalem and his abduction into Egypt. And he arranged it so that, exclusive of the short introduction (ch. i.) and the conclusion (ch. xxxvi. with xlv.), it contained three great divisions: (1) threatening discourses against Israel, ch. ii.–xxiv., a group of seven pieces; (2) a general survey of all nations, the heathen as well as Israel, ch. xlvi.–xlix., together with ch. xxv., which closes this portion, and ch. xxvi. xxix. more loosely attached to it; (3) hopeful pictures in ch. xxx.–xxxiii., with three historical supplements, ch. xxxiv. and xxxv. At a later time, in Egypt, Jeremiah himself inserted the historical portions which were written there, ch. xxxvii.–xliv., between ch. xxxvi. and ch. xlv.; while some one else subjoined the utterances against Egypt, xlvi. 13–26, and ch. ii. 10–19. Finally, at the close

of the exile, the oracle against Babylon (ch. l. and li.) was composed in Jeremiah's name by an imitator of the prophet, and was placed at the end of his prophecy against foreign nations. Still later, the pieces against foreign nations were thrown back to the end of the book, some additional transpositions of verses and superscriptions were effected, together with some interpolations, and ch. lii. was annexed.—All these hypotheses are too artificial and unnatural ever to assume an air of probability, even if they rested on a more solid basis than the assumptions of total disorder prevailing throughout the collection, of manifold recensions of the text, and of a mass of later interpolations, arbitrary transpositions, and the like.—Altogether unsatisfactory, too, are the remarks of *Nägelsbach*, in *Herzog's* Real-Encycl. vi. p. 485 ff., as to the arrangement and the origination of the book. [*Bleek's* view, pp. 496–9, is much the same as Keil's, only that he looks on the Alexandrian recension as the original form. He observes, that if Baruch gave special assistance to the prophet in arranging the book, or if he afterwards edited it, placing ch. lii. as a historical appendix, it was very natural that he should place immediately before it the message to himself, which stands there in the Septuagint, though in the Hebrew copies it is ch. xlv. He says that of course we are not entitled to infer, from the command in ch. xxxvi., that Jeremiah had never previously set any of his prophecies down in writing; and indeed he thinks the contrary more probable, from the expression in ver. 18, יִקְרָא, as if he *read* to Baruch.]

EZEKIEL (יְחֶזְקֵאל).

Commentaries:—*Casp. Sanctius, Maldonatus;* see § 225. *Hier. Pradus* et *Jo. Bapt. Villalpandus* in Ezech. explanatt. et apparatus urbis ac templi Hierosol. commentariis illustr., Romæ 1596–1604, 3 voll. fol. *Œcolampadius, Calvin, Selneccer, Coccejus, Clericus, Venema, Rosenmüller, Maurer;* see § 224. *Jo. Fr. Starckius*, Comm. in proph. Ezech., Francofurti 1731, 4to. *Umbreit*, prakt. Comm. üb. den Hesekiel, mit exeg. u. krit. Anmerkk., Hamburg 1843. *H. Andr. Chr. Hävernick*, Comm. üb. den Proph. Ezechiel, Erlangen 1843. *F. Hitzig*, d. Proph. Ezech. erklärt, Leipzig 1847 (Lieferung 8 of the kurzgefasst. exeg. Handbuch. *J. F. Böttcher*, Proben alttestl. Schrifterklärung, Leipzig 1833, p. 218 ff. (exeg. krit. Versuch über die ideale Beschreibung der Tempelgebäude Ezech. c. xl. ff.). *W. Neumann*, die Wasser des Lebens. Ein exeg. Versuch über Ezech. xlvii. 1–12, Berlin 1849. [*Fairbairn*, Ezekiel, and the Book of his

Prophecy, Edinburgh 1851, second ed. 1855. Also the recent commentaries of *Keil*, 1868, and *Hengstenberg*, 1868.]

§ 77. *The Person of the Prophet.*

Ezekiel, the son of a priest, Buzi, was carried into captivity, along with king Jehoiachin and the better classes of the people, eleven years before the destruction of Jerusalem, by the Chaldeans to Upper Mesopotamia, beside the river Chaboras; and there he lived a married life, and had a house at a place named Tel-Abib (i. 2, 3, comp. with 2 Kings xxiv. 14 ff.; also iii. 15, viii. 1, xxiv. 18). He was called to the prophetic office in the fifth year of his exile (i. 1) (1), and prophesied on to at least the twenty-seventh year, that is, the sixteenth year after the destruction of Jerusalem (xxix. 17), among the captives, by whom he was held in high esteem (viii. 1, xiv. 1, xx. 1, xxxiii. 30 ff.). We do not know how long he continued to prophesy after this date, nor at what time his life came to a close (2).

(1) The statement, "It came to pass in the *thirtieth* year" (i. 1), refers either to the era of Nabopolassar (?), or to the eighteenth year of Josiah (2 Kings xxii.); see *Häv.* on the passage. It can scarcely refer to the year of jubilee (*Hitzig*, following the Rabbins), and still less to the year of the prophet's life (*Hengstb.* Christol. ii. p. 529), since there is added immediately, "in the fourth month, in the fifth day of the month." [Yet, in favour of this view, it may be alleged that none of the prophets is so *sacerdotal* as Ezekiel; and that thirty was the age for work in the sanctuary. *Bleek*, p. 505, also thinks that it must be some public era, Jewish or Babylonian, he does not know which. At pp. 516–517 he says that undoubtedly Ezekiel would be personally acquainted with Jeremiah, who had been a prophet for nearly thirty years when Ezekiel was carried captive; and that Ezekiel must often have heard him, or read his utterances, and in his exile might have later ones brought to him. He pronounces the opinion of *Ewald* and others probable, that Ezekiel made use of Jeremiah's prophecies, referring to *De Wette*, § 223, Anm. *c.* He adds that the meaning of *Josephus* is obscure when he speaks of "*two* books of Ezekiel" (Antiq. x. 5, 1); on which the younger *Bleek* remarks, that it can hardly refer to Jeremiah, though this is the view of *Eichhorn*, *Bertholdt*, *Häv.*, and *Movers.*]

(2) See the apocryphal legends regarding him in *Carpzov*, p. 202 sqq., and in *Winer*, bibl. Real-Wörterbuch, in the article on Ezekiel.

[*Bleek*, p. 505, notices that in Ecclus. xlix. 8, 9, he is praised simply with reference to his book, no reference being made to his personal history, of which we know nothing besides what we learn from the book itself; and he assigns no weight to the statement of the *pseudo-Epiphanius* (de vitis Prophetarum, ii. p. 240), and others, that he suffered martyrdom at the hands of his own countrymen.]

In the person of Ezekiel we meet with a character very decided and sharply marked, of genuine priestly turn of mind, with rich endowments, with uncommon imagination, with imposing energy, with a noble creative imagination, and with powerful burning eloquence. These qualities made him a mighty organ of the Divine Spirit, and enabled him to exert a varied and permanent influence upon the rebellious generation of the captivity; and they have contributed not a little to give that new shape and that peculiar development of spirit to Judaism which have prevailed since the exile (3).

(3) *Hengstb. ibid.* p. 532, characterizes Ezekiel excellently as "a powerful, gigantic nature, and thus fitted to combat effectively the Babylonian spirit of the age, which delighted in powerful, gigantic, and grotesque forms,—standing all alone, and yet worth a hundred schools of the prophets. We see how important his influence was, from this, that the elders of the people used to assemble in his house, in order to learn what the Word of the Lord was; which is a sign that his spiritual dignity was formally and publicly acknowledged in the colony."—One-sided and unfair judgments are pronounced upon Ezekiel by *Gesenius*, Jesai. ii. p. 205, and by *De Wette*, § 223, who make his shallowness and poverty of mind the explanation of "his Levitical turn of mind, in virtue of which he sets a high value upon sacred customs" (iv. 14; xx. 12, 16, 20, 21, 24; xxii. 8, 26); also by *Ewald*, ii. p. 209, who sees in it only "a consequence of the one-sided literary apprehension of antiquity—by means of books and traditions exclusively, and of the depression of mind which was ever augmenting, the longer that the banishment and bondage of the people continued." There are similar remarks in *Hitzig*, p. viii. f. [*Bleek*, p. 516, reckons him inferior to none of the prophets in moral earnestness; yet he charges his descriptions with being too diffuse, prolix, and detailed, giving as examples, ch. xl.–xlviii. xxvii. xvi. xxiii.] On the contrary, comp. the just and solid estimate of the prophet in *Hav.* Comm. p. xiii. ff.

The prophetic address assumes many forms in Ezekiel. The didactic discourse readily links itself on to proverbs (xii. 22, 23, xvi. 44, 45, xvii. 1, 2, xviii. 2), and finds expression in pretty lengthened sentences, with rhetorical amplification and diffuseness; at times, also, it rises to the height of poetry, and to the lyric form of actual songs (xix. xxvii. xxxii.). But, again, it retires behind symbolical and allegorical representation, which developes great wealth of majestic intuitions, of bold images which far transcend actual existences, and of colossal symbols; not unfrequently it is embodied in symbolical actions (iv., v. 1 ff., xii. 3 ff., xxiv. 3 ff., 15 ff., xxxvii. 16, 17). This method of representation gives to his prophecies a mysterious character, often darkening into the enigmatic, which greatly increases the difficulty of understanding them (4).

(4) *Jerome* often complains of this obscurity; see the passages in *Carpzov*, p. 212. He names the book "oceanum et mysteriorum Dei labyrinthum;" and amongst other things he writes, ad Paulin., "Tertius (qui Ezechiel in prophetis est) principia et finem tantis habet obscuritatibus involuta, ut apud Hebræos istæ partes cum exordio Geneseos ante annos triginta non legantur." Comp. also *Zunz*, die gottesdienstl. Vorträge d. Juden, p. 163.

The style of Ezekiel is characterized by a multitude of expressions and formulas peculiar to himself, and constantly recurring (5). His language certainly exhibits the originality of his mind, by a great number of words and forms, which never occur again, the formation of which is due mostly to himself (6): this, however, cannot hide the fact of its dependence on ancient models, especially on the language of the Pentateuch. Neither could it longer resist the inroads of Aramaism, and of the degenerate popular language; so that the manifold anomalies and corruptions in his writings betray the decline and approaching ruin of the Hebrew language (comp. § 17), and remind us that the prophet's home was in a foreign land.

(5) Such, for instance, are the constant address to the prophet, "Son of man," ii. 1, 3, 6, 8, iii. 1, 3, 4, etc.; the frequent designation of the people as a "rebellious house," ii. 5, 6, 7, 8, iii. 9, 26, 27, xii. 2, 3, 9, xvii. 12, xxiv. 3—comp. xliv. 6; the formula, "they shall know that I am Jehovah," v. 13, vi. 10, 14, vii. 27,

xii. 15, etc., or, "they shall know that there hath been a prophet among them," ii. 5, xxxiii. 33; "the hand of Jehovah was upon me," i. 3, iii. 22, xxxvii. 1, xl. 1—comp. viii. 1; "set thy face against," iv. 3, 7, vi. 2, xiii. 17, xxi. 2, 7 [English ver. xx. 46, xxi. 2], xxv. 2, xxviii. 21, etc.; "as I live, the solemn utterance of the Lord Jehovah," v. 11, xiv. 16, 18, 20, xvi. 48, xvii. 16, xviii. 3, xx. 31, 33, xxxiii. 11, xxxv. 11; and the frequently repeated "thus saith the Lord Jehovah," to be found even when Jehovah Himself is speaking, ii. 4, iii. 11, 27, v. 5, 7, 8, vi. 3, 11, vii. 2, 5, etc.; or, "the solemn utterance of the Lord Jehovah," v. 11, xi. 8, 21, xii. 25, etc.

(6) Peculiar words: בְּתֵק, "cut down" [*Eng.* ver. "thrust through"], xvi. 40; דָּלַח, "to trouble [waters]," xxxii. 2, 13; טָעָה for תָּעָה, "to wander" [occurring in the causative, Eng. ver. "to seduce"], xiii. 10; כָּחַל, "to paint (the eyes)," xxiii. 40; כָּפַן, "to languish," xvii. 7; כָּסַם, "to cut hair," xliv. 20; נָצַץ, "to sparkle," i. 7; סָחָה [in the intensive], "to sweep or scrape off," xxvi. 4; פִּכָּה, "to trickle," xlvii. 2; פָּרַח, "to fly," xiii. 20; צָרַב (in Niphal), "to scorch," xxi. 3 [Eng. ver. xx. 47]; קוֹמֵם, "to cut off," xvii. 9; קָרַם, "to cover over" [Eng. ver. "to come up upon"], xxxvii. 6, 8; רָכַם, "to sprinkle upon," xlvi. 14; שָׁשָׁא, "to lead" (?) [Eng. ver. erroneously, "to leave the sixth part"], xxxix. 2; שִׁשָּׁה, "to give the sixth part," xlv. 13; אָהּ, "ah! alas!" vi. 11, xxi. 20 [Eng. ver. 15]; אֲגַפִּים, "bands, forces," xii. 14, xvii. 21, and often; אֵילָם, an architectural term, xl. 16, 21 ff.; אֲמֻלָּה, from אָמַל, "to languish," xvi. 30; אַשֻּׁרִים, some kind of pine, xxvii. 6; בָּזָק, "a flash of lightning," i. 14; בְּרוֹמִים, "damasks" [Eng. ver. "rich apparel"], xxvii. 24; גַּלָּב, "a barber," v. 1; גְּלוֹם, "a cloak" [Eng. ver. "clothes"], xxvii. 24; דֹּחַן, "millet," iv. 9; הֵד, "sounding," vii. 7; הִי, "lamentation, woe," ii. 10; הָהּ, "alas," xxx. 2; הֶפֶךְ, "contrary," xvi. 34; חֹשֶׁן, "arms" [Eng. ver. "chariots," erroneously], xxiii. 24; הוֹבְנִים, "logs of ebony," xxvii. 15; חַיִל, "wall of a house," xiii. 10; חַשְׁמַל, "polished brass" [or "electron," erroneously taken in Eng. ver. for "amber"], i. 4, 27, viii. 2; טִיחַ, "daubing, plastering," xiii. 12; יֵזַע, "sweat," xliv. 18; מֶשִׁי, "spun (silk)," xvi. 10, 13; נְדָה and נָדָן, "liberal gift," xvi. 33; נְהִי, "wailing" [perhaps "confused noise of people"], vii. 11; נֶקֶב, "collet or bezel of a ring" [Eng. ver. "pipe"], xxviii. 13; סָרָב, "rebel" [Eng. ver. "brier"], ii. 6; סִלּוֹן, "thorn," ii. 6, xxviii. 24; סָרְעָפָה, "bough," xxxi. 5; פַּנַּג, some kind of cake, xxvii. 17; צַפְצָפָה, "willow" [perhaps "water-plant"], xvii. 5; צֵיעִים, "excrements," iv. 15; פִּתּוֹת, the same as פַּת, "a piece, fragment," xiii. 19; קוֹץ, "stallion," metaphorically "a prince" [perhaps a proper name, as Eng. ver.],

xxiii. 23; קֶסֶת, "[ink] bottle," ix. 2, 3, 11; שְׂאֵט, "despite," xxv. 6, 15, xxxvi. 5; שְׁחִיף, "thin board" ["cieled," Eng. ver.], xli. 16.—Peculiar forms of words: גֹּעַל, with *o* for *a*, "contempt," xvi. 5—comp. Jud. ix. 26 [where *Ga'al* is a proper name]; מְחִי, "percussion," xxvi. 9; רֶתַח, "boiling," xxiv. 5; שָׂחוּ, "swimming," xlvii. 5; אִבְחָה, "turning" (?) [or perhaps "destruction," or "point" as Eng. ver.], xxi. 20 [Eng. ver. 15]; בִּנְיָה, xli. 13, and בִּנְיָן, xl. 5, xli. 12, "building;" בַּקֶּרֶת, "careful search," xxxiv. 12; גֶּרֶשׁ, "expulsion," xlv. 9; זֶרֶם, "issue (of horses)," xxiii. 20; חַבְלָה, xviii. 7, and חֶבֶל, xviii. 12, 16, xxxiii. 15, "a pledge;" חֶלְאָה, "poisonous rust, verdigris," xxiv. 6, 11, 12; יְנִיקָה, "young twig," xvii. 4; יִפְעָה, "splendour," xxviii. 7, 17; כְּסָתוֹת, "pillows," xiii. 18; מְכוֹרָה, xvi. 3, and מְכֵרָה, xxi. 35 [Eng. ver. 30], xxix. 14, "birth, extraction;" עִוָּה, "overturning," xxi. 32 [Eng. ver. 27]; קְבָצָה, "gathering, heap," xxii. 20; קְפָדָה, "destruction," vii. 25; רְאוּת, "a looking at," xxviii. 17; רָגָז, "trembling," xii. 18; רְכֻלָּה, "traffic," xxviii. 5, 16, 18; שְׂבְעָה, "fulness, satiety," xvi. 49; צַמֶּרֶת, "foliage" [or "highest branch," as Eng. ver.], xvii. 3, 22, xxxi. 3, 10, 14; תָּכְנִית, "measure, structure" [or "pattern, sum," as Eng. ver.], xliii. 10, xxviii. 12; מְרִירוּת, "bitterness," xxi. 11, [Eng. ver. 6]; אֵיתוֹן [Kthib יאתן], "entrance," xl. 15: עָגְבוֹן, "fair, profit of markets" [or "wares," Eng. ver.], xxvii. 19, 27, 33; פִּתְחוֹן, "opening," xvi. 63, xxix. 21; שִׁכָּרוֹן, "drunkenness," xxiii. 33, xxxix. 19; שִׁמָּמוֹן, "astonishment, stupor," iv. 16, xii. 19; הִתּוּךְ, "melting," xxii. 22; הַשְׁמָעוּת, "the act of hearing," xxiv. 26; מָסֹרֶת, "bond," xx. 37; מִבְנֶה, "building, framework," xl. 2; מִבְרָח, "flight" ["fugitives," Eng. ver.], xvii. 21; מַחְמַל, "object of desire" [or "of pity," Eng. ver.], xxiv. 21; מִכְלוֹל, "perfection, completeness," xxiii. 12, xxxviii. 4, and מִכְלֻלִים, "things perfectly beautiful," xxxvii. 24 ["all sorts of things," Eng. ver.; others translate both words "purple"]; מִמְשַׁח, "expansion" [perhaps better, "anointing," as Eng. ver.], xxviii. 14; מִסְפָּחוֹת, "cushions" [or "kerchiefs, head-coverings," as Eng. ver.], xiii. 18, 21; מִסְכָּה, "covering," xxviii. 13; מַעֲרָב, "market, merchandise," xxvii. 13, 17, 27, 33, 34; מַפָּץ, "breaking in pieces," ix. 2; מִקְסָם, "divination," xii. 24, xiii. 7; מִרְבָּה, "size, largeness," xxiii. 32; מַרְכֹּלֶת, "merchandise" [perhaps "place of trade"], xxvii. 24; מִרְמָשׂ, "mire" [better, "that which is trodden," as Eng. ver.], xxxiv. 19; מִשְׁטַח, "spreading" [better, "place for spreading"], xxvi. 5, 14, xlvii. 10 [in the first two texts the form is slightly varied, מִשְׂטָח]; מִשְׁקוֹל, "weight," iv. 10; מִשְׁקָע, ["a depression"] where water settles, xxxiv. 18; תְּאֻנִים, "toils, distresses" [erroneously in Eng. ver. "lies"], xxiv. 12; תַּזְנוּת, "whoredom," xvi. 15, 20, and often; תְּרוּמִיָּה, "heave-offering, offering" [but it may be an adjective, "of the

nature of a heave-offering"], xlviii. 12. Comp. the collection of examples in *Zunz*, p. 159; but it stands in need of sifting.

§ 78. *Contents and Arrangement of the Book of Ezekiel.*

The prophecies of Ezekiel have been brought together in a book well arranged, with good divisions. It is separable into two halves, each of twenty-four chapters, which are respectively earlier and later than the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple, an event which made an epoch in his prophetic working.—The *first* half contains the prophecies before the destruction of Jerusalem (ch. i.–xxiv.), arranged exactly in chronological order (1), and divisible again into *three* sections. 1. The calling of the prophet, and the first general execution of the commission which was entrusted to him by that calling; that is to say, the circumstantial announcement of the ruin of Judah and Jerusalem, impending over the rebellious people, and near at hand: this was in the fifth year of the exile (i.–vii.). 2. A cycle of visions and prophetic discourses relating to the rejection and expulsion of the covenant people, with detailed evidence of the guilt of the people, their rulers, their priests, and their false prophets; and with special announcement of the punishment about to descend upon the ungodly: these belong to the sixth year of the exile (viii.–xix.). 3. Several discourses, in which there are continual rebukes of the idolatry of the people, and announcements of the fearful judgment upon Jerusalem: these belong to the seventh year of the exile (xx.–xxiii.);—followed up by a concluding prophecy which represents symbolically the destruction of Jerusalem (xxiv.), dated in the ninth year of the captivity, and on the very day on which the siege of Jerusalem began (2). The *second* half of the book contains, 1. the group of prophecies, arranged in the order of the subject-matter, against the seven foreign nations (3), amongst whom the judgments should be accomplished upon the might of heathendom viewed in its character of hostility to God: some of these prophecies are previous to the destruction of Jerusalem, others contemporaneous with it, and others subsequent to it (xxv.–xxxii.) (4). 2. The prophecies given forth after this catastrophe (xxxiii. 21) as to the restoration of the theocracy, namely: *a.* of the future salvation of Israel, in relation to its conditions and its basis (xxxiii.–xxxvi.); *b.* in relation to its development, beginning with the gift of new life to

the people, and consummated in their victory over all the enemies of the kingdom of God (xxxvii.–xxxix.). 3. The prophecy of the renewal and glorification of the theocracy in the Messianic age, apprehended in the prophetico-symbolical picture of the new temple and the new regulations for the people and the land (xl.–xlviii.).

(1) The chronological sequence is carefully marked by the dates which are given at i. 1, 2 (in the fifth year of the exile), viii. 1 (in the sixth year), xx. 1 (in the seventh year), xxiv. 1 (in the ninth year). The other dates which are given are these: xxvi. 1 (in the eleventh year of the exile), xxix. 1 (in the tenth year), xxix. 17 (in the twenty-seventh year), xxx. 20 (in the eleventh year), xxxi. 1 (in the eleventh year), xxxii. 1 (in the twelfth year), xxxii. 17 (in the twelfth year), xxxiii. 21 (in the twelfth year), and xl. 1 (in the twenty-fifth year of the exile, and the fourteenth year after the destruction of Jerusalem). [As xxxiii. 21 makes the news of the taking of Jerusalem be brought to the prophet in the *twelfth* year, the tenth month, the fifth day of the month, that is, eighteen months after the event, *Bleek*, p. 509, is inclined to conjecture "in the *eleventh* year," with the Syriac, *Döderlein*, *Ewald*, and *Hitzig* reading עַשְׁתֵּי instead of שְׁתֵּי: the Septuagint reads "in the *tenth* year, which is evidently erroneous.]

(2) *Hāv.* Einl. p. 263, divides the first half of the book into five sections:—(1.) The prophet's call, i.–iii. 15. (2.) The first general accomplishment of the commission entrusted to the prophet in his call, iii. 16–vii. (3.) The announcement made of the rejection and expulsion of the covenant people, on account of the desecration of the temple by idolatry, viii.–xi. (4.) Detailed threatening discourses against the most important prejudices and perverse actions of that time, xii.–xix. (5.) Announcement of judgment upon the people and the city, xx.–xxiii. Then the conclusion of this entire series of prophecies, that is, an exposition of the importance of the punishment coming on the people in connection with the siege of Jerusalem, xxiv. —*Ewald's* (p. 216 f.) division of the first half of the book according to three periods or circles, in the active life of the prophet, ch. i.–xi., ch. xii.–xx., and ch. xxi.–xxiv., runs counter to the chronological statements, which must be taken as the standard of division in Ezekiel; comp. *Hitzig*, p. ix.

(3) It is impossible not to observe an intention on the part of the prophet, when he confines to *seven* the number of the heathen nations that are to fall; otherwise we should scarcely find Sidon separately brought forward alongside of Tyre, xxviii. 20 ff. (*Ewald*, p. 307;

Hitzig, p. 187). [*Bleek*, p. 509, note, denies this; saying that these nations are not brought forward individually, and still less are they so collectively, in such a way as to lead us to think that the prophet gave any weight to the number *seven*, or introduced it intentionally. Yet at p. 508 he notices that the prophecies against Pharaoh, or Egypt, are also seven in number.] Also the order in which these prophecies stand connected, deviating as it does from chronological sequence, has a deeper foundation in the subject-matter. "First the judgment is predicted against the neighbouring nations, Ammon, xxv. 1–7; Moab, vers. 8–11; Edom, vers. 12–14; and the Philistines, vers. 15–17: these rising up in open enmity to the theocracy, represent in this the might of heathendom, as it has turned away from God, and is arrested in the very act of rebellion against Him." Then follow the prophecies against Tyre and Sidon, xxvi.–xxviii. "In Tyre is represented the image of vainglory, and of fleshly security, which looks away from God, and thus plunges ever deeper into the sinfulness and inanity of the natural life." "Finally, both of these sides meet together in Egypt, xxix.–xxxii., that ancient enemy of the covenant people, now strengthened so as to become one of the empires of the world, and as such taking its stand in unbending defiance and vainglory; yet now, like all the rest, on the point of being hurled down into an abyss from the summit of its ancient splendour" (*Häv.* Comm. p. 405).

(4) The position of the prophecies against the foreign nations, in the middle between the threatening predictions before Jerusalem was destroyed and the announcements of salvation after this catastrophe, is due to the internal bond of connection, which is real and causal. It is brought about by means of the following thought. "Though the covenant people fall under the heathenish worldly power, still this is not a victory of heathenism over the true theocracy. Far from this, heathenism, with all its might and glory, must fall; and on the other hand the theocracy shall rise again from its ruins to new life in glory." Comp. *Häv.* Comm. p. 404.

§ 79. *Genuineness of the Prophecies of Ezekiel.*

The stamp of this prophet's eminently peculiar individuality is so plainly impressed upon the prophecies of Ezekiel, in thoughts and language, that doubts as to their genuineness have met with no response (1); and the authenticity of the entire book is unanimously acknowledged, even by the most recent expositors (2).

(1) Like the attack of an English critic on the genuineness of

ch. xxv.–xxxii., xxxv., xxxvi., xxxviii., and xxxix., published in Germany by *Gabler* (neuestes theol. Journ. 1799, ii. 1, p. 322 ff.), which *Jahn* (Einl. ii. p. 600) has refuted at unnecessary length; also the attacks of *Oeder* and *Vogel* (freie Unters. über einige BB. des Alten Testaments herausgg. v. *Vogel*, pp. 344 ff., 373 ff.) upon the genuineness of ch. xl.–xlviii., and of *Corrodi* (Beleuchtung des jüdischen u. christl. Bibelkanons, i. p. 95 ff.) on ch. xxxviii.–xlviii., the frivolous nature of which has been shown by *Beckhaus* (Integrität der proph. Schriften, p. 251 ff.). Comp. *Häv.* Einl. pp. 270–1.

(2) The learned Jew *Zunz* (p. 158 ff.) is quite alone in the assertion (which he has put forward on account of the very special predictions, which are a stumblingblock to him), that Ezekiel and his visions stand nearer the Persian epoch and culture than is commonly believed, belonging perhaps to the age of Cyrus: but his arguments are entirely superficial, and can prove nothing. Against them comp. *Häv.* Einl. p. 271 ff.—*Gesenius*, Geschichte der hebr. Sprache, p. 35, remarks that "the book of Ezekiel belongs to that not very numerous class which from the beginning to the end maintain a unity of tone, which is evinced by favourite expressions and peculiar phrases; and by this, were there nothing else, every suspicion that particular sections may be spurious ought to be averted."

§ 80. *Origination of the Book of Ezekiel.*

It is manifest at once that Ezekiel committed all his prophecies to writing himself, from this circumstance, that he speaks of himself in the first person, with the exception of two instances, where the nature of the case forbade it, i. 3, xxiv. 24. But it is not true that he merely wrote them down and circulated them in a written form, without ever uttering them by the living voice (1): nor yet that he did not compose ch. i.–xxiv. till after the destruction of Jerusalem, so that for critical consideration the oral and the written discourses are coincident, and the very determinate predictions (xi., xxiv. 2, 26, comp. xxxiii. 21) are mere *vaticinia ex eventu* (2).—Also the collection of the prophecies and the publication of the book are to be traced back to the prophet himself: not only because there is a symmetry prevailing in the disposition and arrangement of the whole, which is edited in accordance with a steady plan that is intimately connected with the prophet's labours (§ 78); but also for this reason,

that in the whole book not the slightest trace is to be found of later groupings or transpositions (3).

(1) As *Gramberg* (Geschichte der Religion, ii. p. 403) and *Hitzig*, p. x. f., suppose.

(2) The way and manner in which *Hitzig*, p. xiv., tries to put a good face upon this assertion, only shows how cunningly rationalistic prejudices can stifle all susceptibility for truth.

(3) *Jahn's* (Einl. ii. p. 593) assumption, that there has been a later transposition of the oracles against the foreign nations, has arisen from mere want of insight into the principle of the arrangement of these prophecies according to the subject-matter.—*Ewald* also, p. 207 ff., goes off, like *Eichhorn* and *Bertholdt*, into all sorts of arbitrary combinations and guesses as to the way in which this book of Ezekiel originated: for instance, that the prophecies came to be written down only at a later period, and that the present book came into existence only by degrees, for which assertion he adduces arguments entirely destitute of value; that the prophet was no longer on the original scene of his labours at the time when his book was arranged (p. 214), an allegation which can by no means be inferred from i. 1, 3, iii. 15, 22; that he last of all inserted ch. xxix. 17–21 into the book, which in other respects was already completed,—a supposition which, without any reason whatever, identifies the process of receiving the revelations and committing them to writing with that of editing the book; that in ch. xlvi. 16–24 two little pieces have been wrongly placed, for some unknown reason, since xlvi. 16–18 ought to have come after xlv. 8, and xlvi. 19–24 after xlii. 14 (p. 218), in which instance his "unknown cause" at once awakens just suspicions of the correctness of the assertion. Even *Hitzig*, p. 360, remarks of the second piece, in spite of his finding the place which *Ewald* has assigned to it very suitable, "Yet that the section (vers. 19–24) did not stand there originally is clear: partly from the circumstance that, according to xlii. 1–9, Ezekiel was already at those cells mentioned in ver. 19, and if nothing lay between the two passages, he would not now describe them so circumstantially; partly from the absence of any connection between xlii. 15 and xlvi. 21, 22, where we are informed of the measurements of the exterior building." See the correct view as to the position of the entire ch. xlvi., and of its individual sections, in *Häv.* Comm. p. 719 ff. [*Bleek*, p. 515, agrees generally with the views of *Keil* in this section; and in particular, he looks on it as tolerably certain that Ezekiel edited his own prophecies.]

B. THE TWELVE MINOR PROPHETS (תְּרֵי עָסָר or תְּרֵיסַר).

Commentaries:—*Casp. Sanctius*, see § 225.—*Luther, Selneccer, Tarnov* (c. præf. *J. B. Carpzovii*, Francofurti et Lipsiæ 1688, 1706, 4to), *Seb. Schmidt.*—*Œcolampadius, Calvin, Mercerus* (only the first five minor prophets), *Drusius, Coccejus, Jo. Marckius, Clericus, Rosenmüller, Maurer*, see § 224.—*Phil. Dav. Burkii* Gnomon in xii. proph. min, Heilbronnæ 1753, 4to.—*C. F. Stäudlin*, Beitrr. zur Erläut. der bibl. Propheten; als Versuche Hos. Nah. Hab. neu übersetzt und erläutert, Stuttgart 1786.—*H. Hesselberg*, die zwölf kleinen Propheten ausgelegt, Königsberg 1838.—*Umbreit*, prakt. Comm. üb. die kleinen Propheten mit. exeg. u. krit. Anmerkk., Hamburg 1845.—*F. Hitzig*, die 12 kleinen Propheten erklärt, Leipzig 1838, 2d ed., 1852 (Lief. 1 des kurzgefasst. exeget. Handbuchs).—*Hengstenberg*, Christologie des Alten Test., 2d ed., Berlin 1854–6, vols. i. and iii.—*P. Schegg*, die kleinen Propheten übersetzt u. erklärt, 2 Theile, Regensburg 1854.—[*Ed. Pocock, D.D.*, Commentaries on Hosea, Joel, Micah, and Nahum, in his Theol. Works, 2 vols., London 1740.—*Eb. Henderson, D.D.*, The Twelve Minor Prophets, 2d ed., London 1858.—*E. Pusey*, The Minor Prophets, with a commentary and introductions (as far as Mic. i. 12), Oxford, Cambridge, and London, 1861.—*K. F. Keil*, die kleinen Propheten, Leipzig 1866.]

§ 81. *Collection and Arrangement.*

These twelve prophetic writings were combined into one work so early as at the collection of the Canon; and in the Canon they have ever been regarded and enumerated as one book (1).

(1) Already Jesus Sirach, xlix. 10, *καὶ τῶν δώδεκα προφητῶν τὰ ὀστᾶ ἀναθάλοι ἐκ τοῦ τόπου αὐτῶν, κ.τ.λ.* (although the passage lies under suspicion of being interpolated), regards them as one book; and so do *Josephus*, c. Ap. i. 8, and *Gregory Nazianzen*, Carm. xxxiii., *Μίαν μέν εἰσιν ἐς γραφὴν οἱ Δώδεκα.* Agreeably to this, the Rabbins speak of *four* נביאים אחרונים [later prophets, in contradistinction to their so-called earlier prophets—namely, the books of Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings], that is, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the *δωδεκαπρόφητον.* Comp. *Carpzov*, p. 270 sq. Whether the writings of those minor prophets who lived earlier than the exile were before that time united into one collection, or written together upon a single roll, cannot now be determined. *Kimchi*, præf. Comm. in Hos., says,

"Tradunt doctores nostri piæ memoriæ, esse illos in unum librum coactos, ne si singuli seorsim manerent, unus aut alter ob parvitatem periret." [This is extremely likely, and seems in some measure to be confirmed by the very title, *Minor Prophets*, by which they are always known, and which of course has reference, not to their importance or authority, but solely to their smaller bulk. Thus *Bleek*, p. 517, quotes *Jerome*, procem. in Esaiam, "Cum Esaias duodecim prophetis juxta numerum versuum aut equalis aut major sit:" and *Augustine*, de Civ. Dei, xviii. 29, "qui propterea dicuntur minores, quia sermones eorum sunt breves in eorum comparatione, qui majores ideo vocantur, quia prolixa volumina condiderunt." He says that undoubtedly this collection was made by the person who collected the second volume of the Canon, the "Prophets" of the Hebrew Bible, whom he takes to have been Nehemiah.]

The arrangement is chronological only to this extent, that the prophets of the Assyrian period (from Hosea to Nahum) precede the two prophets of the Chaldean age (Habakkuk and Zephaniah), which two again are followed by the three who lived after the exile. In other respects the arrangement has been so carried out, that the writings of Hosea are placed at the head, as being the largest in size: while the rest have been very naturally placed in order successively according to the statement of time in their superscriptions; or where no date was given, under the influence of the principle of the association of ideas, according to some association produced by similarity of contents (2). The order is also different in the Hebrew and in the Greek manuscripts; but in neither is the chronological order thoroughly carried out (3).

(2) Comp. *Delitzsch* in *Rudelbach* and *Guericke's* Zeitschrift, 1851, pp. 92–3. "Because Hosea, at the end of his prophetic writings, ch. xiv., foretold to penitent Israel, watered with the dew of divine grace, a rich harvest of corn, and a fresh verdure and blossoming, like the rose, the olive, and the vine; while Joel begins his prophetic writing, ch. i., at a time when the crop of corn, of wine, and of olives has come to nothing, and therefore calls the people to repentance: on this account the collector joins the two prophets together. With fine taste, again, he makes Amos follow Joel; because the latter says, towards the end of his writings, iv. 16 [English version, iii. 16], 'Jehovah also shall roar out of Zion, and utter His voice from Jerusalem,' while Amos begins his book with the same striking words.

A similar striking expression of Amos, ch. ix. 12, 'that they may possess the remnant of Edom,' is repeated by Obadiah, ver. 19, whose whole prophecy is, as it were, an unfolding of this prophetic prospect: therefore Obadiah stands after Amos. But why does Jonah come after Obadiah? Because Obadiah begins, 'We have heard a rumour from Jehovah, and an ambassador is sent among the heathen;' and what else is Jonah than such 'an ambassador sent among the heathen' from Jehovah? Comp. the second verse in Jonah with the first in Obadiah. Again, as a further reason, Jonah, Micah, and Nahum might be arranged together, because they have a common interest in that celebrated utterance of the law with respect to the attributes of God, Ex. xxxiv. 6, 7; see Jonah iv. 2, Micah vii. 18, Nahum i. 2 ff. (yet comp. also Joel ii. 13). Nahum and Habakkuk have a common character which brings them together, both of them having the title 'The burden,' מַשָּׂא; and Habakkuk stands behind Nahum, because he prophesies of the Chaldeans, who were the executioners of that judgment upon Nineveh which Nahum has depicted. Zephaniah has been thrown back thus far, because his writings bear the latest date of any that precede the captivity; and he takes his place behind Habakkuk, because he has in common with him the striking words הס מפני אדני יהוה, Zeph. i. 7, Hab. ii. 20." [The latter is shorter. See additional remarks at the end of the next Note.]

(3) In favour of the chronological principle of arrangement, there have decided *Jerome*, Prol. in xii. proph. min., "in quibus (prophetarum scriptis) tempus non profertur in titulo, sub illis eos regibus prophetasse, sub quibus et hi, qui ante eos habent titulos, prophetarunt;" and in recent times, particularly *Caspari*, Obadj. p. 37 ff., *Häv.* Einl. pp. 26 and 275, and *Hengstb.* [*Bleek*, p. 518, considers this principle of Jerome's decidedly false: he thinks it in the highest degree probable that the collector was guided by the chronological principle, but holds him to have been mistaken in point of fact as to the age of several of the prophets.] On the contrary, *Jäger*, de ordine prophetarum min. chronol., Tubingæ, 2 PP. 1823, 1827 (abridged in the Tübingen Zeitschrift für Theol. 1828, H. ii.), and most of the recent critics; last of all *Delitzsch*, *ibid.* (who had previously expressed a different opinion in *Rudelbach* and *Guericke's* Zeitschrift, 1842, i. p. 14 ff.).—That the chronological principle of arrangement rests upon a firm traditional basis, with the strongest claims to credibility (*Häv.*), is not capable of proof.—The difference of arrangement in the Masoretic and Alexandrian copies is as follows [differing only as to the first six]:

According to the HEBREW.		According to the SEPTUAGINT.	
I. Hosea.	(1)	1. Hosea.	(I.)
II. Joel.	(4)	2. Amos.	(III.)
III. Amos.	(2)	3. Micah.	(VI.)
IV. Obadiah.	(5)	4. Joel.	(II.)
V. Jonah.	(6)	5. Obadiah.	(IV.)
VI. Micah.	(3)	6. Jonah.	(V.)
VII. Nahum.		7. Nahum.	
VIII. Habakkuk.		8. Habakkuk.	
IX. Zephaniah.		9 Zephaniah.	
X. Haggai.		10. Haggai.	
XI. Zechariah.		11. Zechariah.	
XII. Malachi.		12. Malachi.	

The chronological order would be:

		B.C.
1. OBADIAH, under king Joram [of Judah],	some time within	889–884
2. JOEL, ,, ,, Joash [of Judah],	,, ,,	877–838
3. JONAH, ,, ,, Jeroboam II.	,, ,,	824–783
4. AMOS, ,, kings Jeroboam II. and Uzziah,	,, ,,	810–783
5. HOSEA, ,, ,, Jerob. II. and Uzziah to Hezekiah,	,, ,,	790–725
6. MICAH, ,, ,, Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah,	,, ,,	758–700
7. NAHUM, in the second half of Hezekiah's reign,	,, ,,	710–699
8. HABAKKUK, under Manasseh or Josiah,	,, ,,	650–627
9. ZEPHANIAH, ,, Josiah,	,, ,,	640–625
10. HAGGAI, in the second year of Darius Hystaspis,	,, ,,	519
11. ZECHARIAH, under Darius Hystaspis,	beginning	519
12. MALACHI, ,, Artaxerxes Longimanus,	some time between	433–424

[This chronological arrangement, so far as it rests on internal reasons, must be considered very precarious; and those who admit, with *Bleek*, that the collector of the twelve prophets into one book was guided by the chronological order as he understood it, ought to feel themselves very sure of their ground before they pronounce him mistaken; since, even granting that he laid and had no claim to infallibility, he yet had means of information which we wholly want, and which we can scarcely doubt were tolerably precise and well founded. Certainly, if those modern critics are right who place Joel and Obadiah so very early as is done in this table, the chronological order can be admitted only in that general sense and limited degree of which *Keil* approves. But if there are no sufficient reasons for placing them so early, nothing else need occasion the slightest difficulty to a person who maintains the chronological order in the strictest sense. For it is

necessary then to attend only to this one circumstance, that in the case of a prophet whose ministry extended over so long a period, for instance, as Hosea's (stated in the table to be from 790 to 725, yet not improbably beginning ten years earlier, or so), that order might be reckoned according to the date of the close, the middle, or the commencement of the ministry; and the first place, which is assigned to Hosea (we may believe partly also on account of the size of his book), implies that the *commencement of his ministry* was the standard of computation, since several of the twelve prophets had certainly finished their labours while he was still in the middle of his. This chronological principle would not be infringed by granting that Jonah began his prophetic ministry earlier than Hosea, when he announced the salvation of the ten tribes through Jeroboam's victories, 2 Kings xiv. 25: for these announcements have not been preserved by the Holy Spirit to form a part of Scripture; and his prophetic agency at Nineveh, with which alone we have here to do, belonged to a later period. And again, this principle might not necessarily have been pressed so far as to justify us in inferring that Haggai began his ministry before Zechariah, had we possessed no date besides that contained in Ezra v. 1; for being practically contemporaneous in their commencement, and Haggai having to deal only with the first of several topics which Zechariah handled, there might be sufficient reason for assigning the priority to him on account of his subject-matter: yet, in point of fact, the dates are given so minutely in the prophetic books themselves, that we do find Haggai preceding Zechariah by about two months.]

I. HOSEA (הוֹשֵׁעַ).

Commentaries:—Hoseas cum Targ. et comment. Rabbin. ed. *Herm. von der Hardt*, Helmstädt 1703. New edition by *J. D. Michaelis*, Göttingen 1775, 4to.—*Jo. Henr. Manger*, Comm. in Hoseam, Campis. 1782, 4to.—*L. Jos. Uhland*, Annotationum hist. exeg. in Hos. P. i.-xii., Tubingæ 1785 ff., 4to.—*Chr. Theoph. Kuinœl*, Hoseæ oracula Hebr. et Lat. perpet. annotat. ill., Lipsiæ 1792.—Hoseas proph. Introductionem præm., vertit, commentatus est, *J. C. Stuck*, Lipsiæ 1828. —*Aug. Simson*, d. Proph. Hosea erklärt u. übersetzt, Hamburg u. Gotha 1851.—*J. F. V. Maurer*, Observatt. in Hoseam in Commentatt.

theol. ed. *Rosenmüller* et *Maurer*, ii. 2 (Lipsiæ 1827), p. 275. *O. C. Krabbe*, Questionum de Hoseæ vaticc. spec. (Hamb. Progr.) 1836, 4to.

§ 82. *The Person of the Prophet.*

Hosea, the son of Beeri, a citizen of the kingdom of Ephraim, of whom we know nothing (1), prophesied under Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah, kings of Judah, and under Jeroboam II., king of Israel (i. 1). His labours lay within this latter kingdom, which at the time of the prophet's appearing had reached, under Jeroboam II., the zenith of its earthly power and greatness. Nevertheless, it was already thrown into internal disorder by idolatry and moral corruption, and after Jeroboam's death it became weakened externally by several rapid changes of dynasty, as well as by anarchy; and thus, without any check, it was ripening for speedy ruin. The superscription, according to which Hosea's prophetic activity lasted about sixty-five years (that is, B.C. 790–725) (2), receives confirmation from the contents of his book. According to i. 4, he made his appearance previous to the fall of the house of Jehu, which he announced as impending and near at hand; and according to the probable explanation of x. 14, he survived the first expedition of Shalmaneser against king Hoshea [whose name in Hebrew is the same as the prophet's, and may perhaps have stood in some relation to it] (2 Kings xvii. 3), which took place shortly after Hezekiah's succession, and he was still continuing to prophesy after that event (3).

(1) [*Bleek*, p. 518, observes that the prophet's own name is written in the Sept. Ὡσηέ, but in Rom. ix. 25 it is aspirated, Ὡσηέ; while *Jerome* on i. 1 says that in some manuscripts he found a form Ἀυσή, Ause, but he rejected it.] The identity of *Beeri* with the prince among the Reubenites, *Beerah*, whom Tiglath-pileser carried captive (1 Chron. v. 6), has been maintained by some rabbins; but there is no historical foundation for the opinion. [*Bleek*, p. 519, characterizes it as arbitrary; and he says that the traditions to be mentioned immediately as to the prophet's birth-place are equally destitute of value, and besides are not consistent with one another.] Also the traditional accounts of Hosea's birth-place, *Belemoth*, in the tribe of Issachar, are extremely uncertain (comp. *Carpzov*, p. 274, *Knobel*, der Prophetismus, ii. p. 154, and *Simson*, pp. 1, 2); but there can be no doubt of his Israelitish descent, for various circumstances

bear testimony to this, without taking into consideration that the mission of a prophet from Judah to the kingdom of the Ten Tribes was an event so extraordinary that it would certainly have been mentioned, as is shown by the instances, 1 Kings xiii. and Amos vii. Such circumstances are—(*a*) the very peculiar diction, rough and also tinged with Aramaisms here and there, which assigns the origin of the book to the northern part of Palestine; (*b*) the very intimate acquaintance with the localities of the kingdom of Ephraim (v. 1, vi. 8, 9, xii. 12, xiv. 6 [Eng. ver. xii. 11, xiv. 5] ff.; comp. *Ewald*, i. pp. 117–8); (*c*) passages like i. 2, where this kingdom is called simply "the land," namely, the prophet's land, and vii. 5, where the Israelitish king is designated as "our king."—The reasons adduced by *Jahn*, Einl. ii. p. 413, and *Maurer*, Comment. theol. ii. 1, p. 291 sqq., for tracing his descent from Judah, are entirely valueless; and they have been refuted by *Häv.* p. 277 ff., *Simson*, p. 3 ff., and *Hengstb.* Christol. i. p. 183 ff.

(2) There is as little justification for shortening this period to forty years (*Rosenmüller*, Schol. p. 27), or to fifty-five (*Stuck*, p. 5), as for asserting with *Movers* (d. bibl. Chronik. p. 134), that Hosea was no longer living in the time of Ahaz, far less in that of Hezekiah. See the various opinions in *Simson*, p. 11.—The grounds on which *Hitzig* (Klein. Proph. p. 6 of the 2d ed.), *Ewald*, p. 128, and *Simson*, pp. 9, 10, assail the genuineness of the superscription, and explain the statement in reference to the kings of Judah to be a later interpolation which has been derived from Isa. i. 1, have no significance; comp. *Häv.* p. 281. [*Bleek*, pp. 519, 520, 524, begins by evincing a disposition to question its genuineness, but ends by acquiescing in it.] The circumstance that Jeroboam alone is named, of all the Israelitish kings, is to be explained by this, that he was the *last* king by whom the Lord sent help to His people (2 Kings xiv. 27), and that the following rulers, till the kingdom was overthrown, scarcely deserved the name of kings. "Nam post Jeroboamum II., fortasse excepto filio Sacharja paucissimos menses regnante, omnes a Deo non vocati, ergo nomine regio indigni erant" (*Stuck*, p. 133).

(3) By *Shalman* (x. 14), we can scarcely understand any other king than Shalmaneser, the latter half of this compound name having been omitted for the sake of brevity (comp. the examples of similar abbreviations in *Maurer* on Ps. cxxxii. 6). And Beth-arbel is not the famous city *Arbela* on the Tigris, but, as the *Beth* indicates, the strongly fortified place *Arbela* in Galilee, known to us from 1 Macc. ix. 2, and from *Josephus* (*Gesenius*, *Rosenmüller*, *Maurer*, *Häv.*, *Hengstb.*). This refutes the opinion of *Ewald* (p. 157) about Arbela

on the Tigris, "which must have been stormed and cruelly destroyed a short time previously by a king of Assyria otherwise unknown, named Shalman, probably the predecessor of Pul." *Hitzig's* assumption is perfectly inadmissible, that there was a city *Shalman-beth-arbel.*

The style of Hosea is highly poetical, rich in bold and powerful imagery, full of vigorous thinking and beautiful delineation; yet often abrupt, bounding from one image to another, and by no means free from difficulties and obscurities (4). The language has many peculiar words and unusual constructions (5). The symbolical actions (ch. i.–iii.) are narrated in prose.

(4) *Jerome*, præf. ad xii. proph.: "Commaticus est et quasi per sententias loquens;" comp. the rapidly changing images, v. 9 ff., vi. 1 ff., vii. 8 ff., x. 11 ff., xiii. 3, 7 ff. Besides, his mode of representation manifests great tenderness, softness, and warmth, without taking into account the many vigorous images. He is "the prophet of the highly tragical pain of love. His words are like the beatings of a fevered pulse; his discourse is like a torrent of hot tears; his book is like a wild, stormy sea of deep emotions, yet everywhere so that we can look down to its bed, and observe that it is the unquenchable and essentially unchangeable love of Jehovah" (Erlangen Zeitschrift f. Protest. u. Kirchr. xxviii. 2, p. 129); comp. also *Ewald*, p. 122, *Simson*, pp. 36-7, and *Umbreit* in *Herzog's* Real-Encycl. vi. p. 272.

(5) Unusual words: נַאֲפוּפִים, ii. 4; נִבְלוּת, ii. 12; אָהֲבוּ הֵבוּ, iv. 18; נָזָה, v. 13; מֶלֶךְ יָרֵב, v. 13, x. 6; שַׁעֲרִירִיָּה, vi. 10; הַבְהָבִים, viii. 13; שְׁבָבִים, "fragments" [but possibly "flames"], viii. 6; מִשְׁטֵמָה, ix. 7, 8; חַלָּאוּבֹת, xiii. 5; אֱהִי, "where?" xiii. 14; רֶחֶת, xiii. 1. Rare forms, partly with an Aramaic colouring: תִּרְגַּלְתִּי, xi. 3; וָאֶמְאָסֵאךָ, iv. 6; the infinitive הַכִּי, vi. 9; אוֹכִיל for אַאֲכִיל, xi. 4; קָאם for קָם, x. 14; תָּלוּא, xi. 7; יַפְרִיא for יִפְרֶה, xiii. 15; קִימוּשׁ for קְמוּשׁ, ix. 6. — Remarkable constructions: לֹא עָל, vii. 16; אֶל עַל, xi. 7; צָפָה עִם, ix. 8; נְשַׁלְּמָה פָרִים, xiv. 3; כְּמְרִיבֵי כֹהֵן, iv. 4; רִבִּי תוֹרָתִי, viii. 12; רָעַת רָעַתְכֶם, x. 15. Comp. *Simson*, p. 38, and *Häv.* i. 1, p. 216 f.

§ 83. *The Book of Hosea.*

The prophecies of Hosea relate to the kingdom of Ephraim, so that reference is made to Judah only incidentally (i. 7, ii. 2 [Eng. version i. 11], iv. 15, v. 5, 10, 14, vi. 4, 11, viii. 14, x. 11, xii. 1, 3

[Eng. ver. xi. 12, xii. 2]) (1). However, the book transmitted to us contains, not single utterances or addresses to the people delivered at different times (2), but a composition formed by taking a survey of their essential contents; and this the prophet himself has given at the end of his course. It is arranged in *two* larger sections, of which the *first* (ch. i.–iii.) presents, in a symbolic delineation (3), the first period of his active life, that in the time of Jeroboam, when the way was being paved for the judgments of God; the *second* (ch. iv.–xiv.) presents in a condensed form, throughout a great prophetic discourse, partly threatening and partly hortatory (in which we meet with certain pauses and resting-points, but not with divisions into portions that are really separable), his labours after the death of Jeroboam, when the judgment had already begun to set in.—In favour of this view there is the superscription, דְּבַר יְהוָה, which of itself points to an indivisible whole: and besides, there is the entire absence of chronological determinations, and of sure indications of the beginning and end of individual pieces or discourses in the second part (4); the advance, according to a plan, from wrath and threatening to mercy and promises (5); and the careful articulation of this whole division of the book into firmly settled, clearly distinct, well-proportioned strophes (6).

(1) Like his older [?] contemporary Amos, to whose prophecies he makes reference: comp. viii. 14 with Am. ii. 5; iv. 3 with Am. viii. 8 [not very strongly marked]; iv. 15 with Am. v. 5; besides, גְּאוֹן יִשְׂרָאֵל, v. 5, vii. 10, with גְּאוֹן יַעֲקֹב, Am. vi. 8; and וְפָרַח כָּראשׁ מִשְׁפָּט, x. 4, with הַהֲפַכְתֶּם לְרֹאשׁ מִשְׁפָּט, Am. vi. 12. Yet this is not so decided as to permit us, with *Hitzig* (p. 5), to derive from Amos "the immediate impulse on Hosea to prophesy." [*Bleek*, pp. 522–3, thinks that the passages v. 8–vi. 3, vi. 4–11*a*, xii. are against the two kingdoms taken together; though even in these, he says, the pre-eminence in evil is assigned to Ephraim.]

(2) *Stuck* and *Hitzig*, following *Maurer*, have attempted to point out some of these in the book. Against them, comp. *De Wette* in the Studien u. Krit. 1831, p. 808 ff., and in his Einl. § 227; *Hengstb.* pp. 193–4; *Ewald*, p. 125 ff.; *Häv.* p. 286 ff.; and *Simson*, p. 33 ff.

(3) The symbolical transactions in ch. i.–iii. have no actual occurrence in the outward life of the prophet as their basis (*Hofmann*, Weissagung u. Erfüllung, i. p. 206 ff.); much rather they are purely inward occurrences, merely a peculiarly impressive embodiment of

the attitude of Israel towards their God, for which no image seems more happy or expressive than that of marriage. Comp. the history of the treatment of this question by *Marck*, in the Diatribe de uxore fornicationum, Lugduni Batav. 1696, reprinted in the Tübingen edition of his Comm. on the minor prophets, p. 114 ff.; also the justification of this view by *Hengstb.* i. p. 207 ff. [*Bleek*, pp. 520–1, taking the same view as unquestionably the correct one, notices that *Jerome* had already adopted it. He refers for information to *Lübkert*, die symbolische Handlung Hosea's, in the Studien u. Krit. 1835, 3, pp. 647–656. The opposite opinion is still defended by *Pusey* in his Commentary.]

(4) All attempts to cut up this part into individual discourses, and then to determine these chronologically, and to arrange them, have failed. This has been proved in the case of *Maurer* and *Stuck*, by *De Wette*, *ibid.*; and in the case of *Hitzig*, by the Hall. Allgemeine Litter. Zeitung, 1843, Erg. Bl., Mai, No. 38; and by *Häv.* p. 288. The most recent attempt is to be found in the Erlangen Zeitschrift, *ibid.* p. 98 ff. [*Bleek*, p. 523, agrees with the views of *Keil* in this note, and in the passages to which it refers.]

(5) *De Wette*, *ibid.* p. 813 ff., has correctly recognised this progress; and he has given prominence to the fact, which is in accordance with the plan, that from ch. viii. 1, and onward, the wrath of the prophet is intensified in its threatening tone, and the corruption of Israel stands out more and more distinctly before the reader's eyes. "It is true that such threatenings are to be found earlier, as in v. 8, 9; but those which are uttered in ch. viii. 1–4, 8, ix. 3, 6, 11, 13, 17, x. 5, 7, 10, 14, xi. 5 ff., are far stronger. After the promise in xi. 10, 11, again, a similar gradation appears. Ch. xii. 3 and 15 are still indeterminate and feeble threatenings. Already ch. xiii. 3 is stronger, vers. 7 and 8 much stronger, ver. 15 and xiv. 1 are the strongest of all; upon which there follows that exhortation and promise."—*Ewald* is wrong in drawing ch. iii. over to the second half of the book, so that ch. iii. contains the sign, and ch. iv.–xiv. the explanation of the sign. Then in substance the progress would be something like this: that the discourse makes a transition from (*a*) the accusation of the people, in general and in their several classes (iv.–vi. 11*a*), to (*b*) the contemplation of the punishment, which has been shown to be necessary; and here it reaches its gloomiest and severest point (vi. 11 *b*–ix. 9); until (*c*) it rises again by degrees to serene views and steady hopes, by looking back upon the older, better times, the destiny of the Church, and the everlasting love of Jehovah (ix. 10–xiv. 10). Against this *De Wette* says, Einl. p. 315, "Cer-

tainly we do find glances back into the history in ix. 10, x. 9, xi. 1–4, xii. 4, 5, 13, 14, xiii. 1, 4, 5; but these do not rule the discourse. Much rather there is still a climax of threatening in ix. 11 ff., x. 5 ff., 10, 11, 14, 15; just since we find a similar gradation in the promises after xi. 10, 11." Comp. also *Simson*, p. 29 ff.

(6) Comp. *Ewald*, Propheten, i. p. 128.

From what has been said, it follows of course that the book was composed by Hosea himself; and since no doubts can with any reason be thrown upon its integrity (7), it also follows that the book has come to us without alteration (8).

(7) The attempt of *G. M. Redslob*, "die Integrität der Stelle Hosea vii. 4–10 in Frage gestellt," Hamburg 1842, is too weak to endanger the integrity of the book. Against it, comp. *Häv.* p. 289.

(8) According to *Ewald*, p. 118 f., after Hosea had laboured long in the northern kingdom, he came into Judah, and there he wrote his book. [*Bleek*, p. 523, says he may perhaps have done so, and that this may explain the mention of only one Israelite king in the superscription.] But no "decided testimony" in favour of this is afforded by the words derived from the song of Deborah (Judg. v. 14), and peculiarly applied, "after thee, O Benjamin" (Hos. v. 8),—words which *E. Meier*, in the theol. Studien u. Krit. 1842, pp. 1023–4, would amend in an unintelligible way; nor yet does any light penetrate to us from the various short notices of Judah (i. 7, iv. 15, and others), to show that the prophet was only now learning by little and little to know Judah. Comp. *Häv.* pp. 283–4, and *Simson*, pp. 5, 6. —Since Hosea lived and laboured among the Ten Tribes, so also he certainly composed his book among them. Yet it must have become known immediately in Judah, as the kingdom of Israel did not last much longer [*Bleek*, p. 523, has no doubt that it was written before the overthrow of the kingdom of the Ten Tribes]; and also as Jeremiah has frequently made use of it in his delineations of this kingdom (comp. *Käper*, Jeremias, pp. 67–8).—On the contrary, the allusions and references to Hos. ix. 15 and viii. 4, which are discovered so early as in Isa. i. 23, xxx. 1, by *Hitzig*, p. 5, and by *Häv.* p. 290, are uncertain and improbable.

II. JOEL (יואל).

Commentaries:—Joel cum adnotatt. et versione trium rabbinorum expositus per *Gilb. Genebrardum*, Parisiis 1563, 4to. Joel explicatus, in quo textus Ebr. per paraphr. Chald., Masoram magnam et parvam, perque trium præstantiss. Rabb., R. Sal. Jarchi, R. Aben-Ezrae, et R. Dav. Kimchi, comm., necnon per notas philol. illustratur; cui in fine adjectus est Obadias eodem fere modo illustratus. Auctore *Jo. Leusden*, Ultrajecti 1657. *Ed. Pocockii* Comment. in prophetiam Joelis, e serm. Anglic. nunc primum Latine factus, Lipsiæ 1695, 4to. *Corn. Hasœi* Prophetia Joelis, analysi et positionibus theol. philol. illustrata, Bremæ 1697, 4to. Interpret. Joelis in *Turretini* Tract. de s. Script. interpr. ed. a *Guil. A. Teller*, pp. 307–343. *C. F. Cramer*, Scythische Denkmäler in Palästina, Kiel 1777, pp. 143–245. Joel Lat. versus et notis philol. illustr. ab *A. Svanborg* in sex Dissertatt., Upsalæ 1806, 4to. Translations, with explanatory notes, by *Eckermann* 1786, *Justi* 1792, *Fr. A. Holzhausen* 1829, *K. A. Credner* 1831, *E. Meier* 1841.

For Introduction:—*Fr. Delitzsch* zwei sichere Ergebnisse in Betreff der Weissagungsschrift Joels, in *Rudelbach* and *Guericke's* Zeitschrift, 1851, p. 306 ff.

§ 84. *The Person of the Prophet, and his Time.*

Joel, the son of Pethuel, a person otherwise unknown to us, prophesied in Judah, probably in Jerusalem (i. 14, ii. 1, 15, iii. 5 [English version, ii. 32], iv. [English version, iii.] 1, 2, 6, 7, 16, 17, 20, 21 [to some of which texts *Bleek*, p. 525, adds i. 9, 13, 16, ii. 9, 17]) (1). Nothing is known of the circumstances of his life (2); there is a controversy even as to the age in which he lived. But in any case he belonged to the most ancient of the minor prophets, not to the later portion of them (3). Now, as Amos not only opens his prophecy with an utterance of Joel's (comp. Am. i. 2 with Joel iv. 16), but also concludes with promises similar to those in Joel (comp. Am. ix. 13 with Joel iv. 18) (4), Joel must have prophesied before Amos, that is, before the twenty-seven years during which Uzziah and Jeroboam II. reigned contemporaneously [apparently a slip of the pen, for the "the twenty-seventh year of Jeroboam, in which Azariah or Uzziah began to reign," 2 Kings xv.

1]. We are led to assign a still higher antiquity to the prophecies of Joel by the political relations which come into view in them; since neither the Syrians nor the Assyrians had shown themselves hostile to the theocracy, but only the Phœnicians and the Philistines (iv. 4), the Egyptians and the Edomites (iv. 19). On the one hand, again, there is no mention of the attack upon Jerusalem by the Syrians under Hazael of Damascus, which cost Joash not only the treasures of the palace and of the temple, but also his life (2 Kings xii. 18 ff.; 2 Chron. xxiv. 23 ff.); yet for this Amos (i. 3–5) prophesies the ruin of the Syrian kingdom, and the carrying away of the people to Assyria. On the other hand, there are the two circumstances, that the Edomites were already punished and brought anew into subjection by Amaziah (2 Kings xiv. 7), on account of their revolt from Joram; and that the Philistines had to endure the same at the hands of Uzziah (2 Chron. xxvi. 6, 7), on account of what they had done in the same reign, plundering Jerusalem and carrying away the captive Jews (2 Chron. xxi. 16, 17; comp. with Joel iv. 4–6). For these two reasons we are justified in concluding that Joel prophesied between Joram's reign and the last years of king Joash. But further, partly by the denunciation of the enmity of Tyre and Sidon against Judah (iv. 4), which could not be during the reigns of Joram and Ahaziah, considering the near relationship of these kings to the Tyrian royal family, but must have come on after the fall of Athaliah; partly by the fact that the book of Joel presupposes the existence of a well-arranged worship of Jehovah, under the administration of the priesthood, which was not re-established till after the fall of Athaliah and the elevation of Joash to the throne by means of Jehoiada (2 Kings xi. 17; 2 Chron. xxiii. 16, xxiv. 14),—on both these grounds we are led to assign the first thirty years of Joash, between B.C. 877 and 847, as the chronological position of this prophet's active life (5).

(1) *Jerome*, Comm. ad Joel i. 1: "In Joel . . . omne quod dicitur, ad tribum Juda et ad Jerusalem pertinere credendum est; et nullam omnino Israelis, *i.e.* decem tribuum in hoc fieri mentionem" [ch. ii. 27, iv. 2, 16, seem scarcely exceptions: *Israel* there is the entire people, without reference to their sinful divisions].

(2) The traditional legends as to his extraction from a place,

Bethom (*Βηθώμ*, al. *Θεβυράν*, in the pseudo-Epiphanius), or Bethomeron (Dorotheus Tyrius), in the tribe of Reuben (comp. *Carpzov*, p. 303, and *Knobel*, d. Prophetismus, ii. pp. 131–2), are entirely unauthenticated; and the conjectures that he was a priest and a Levite, drawn by *Knobel*, *De Wette*, and others, from the frequent mention of the priests, the offerings, and the temple festivals, are no less uncertain.

(3) *J. D. Michaelis* (Uebersetzung d. Alten Test. xi. pp. 60–1) wished to make him a contemporary of the Maccabees, but he afterwards abandoned this fancy: on the contrary, *Vatke*, bibl. Theol. i. pp. 462–3, again wished to place him in the period after the exile. *Jahn*, Einl. ii. 502, thinks of the age of Manasseh; *Hengstb.* Christol. i. p. 333 ff., and *Häv.* p. 299 ff., place him between Hosea and Amos, that is, in the time of Jeroboam II. and Uzziah, on the ground that the book of the twelve prophets is arranged strictly according to the chronology. Others take still different views (see *Credner*, p. 39 f., and *Knobel*, p. 140). [*Bleek*, p. 531, rightly rejects the fancy of *Bunsen* (Gott in der Gesch. i. 321 ff.) that its date is from fifteen to twenty-five years after Shishak's invasion; and hence the threat to Egypt (iv. 19).]

(4) Also Am. vii. 1 ff. contains several things which can scarcely be accidental echoes from Joel; comp. in particular, ver. 4 with Joel i. 20; ver. 3 with Joel ii. 13. Besides there are to be found unmistakeable references to Joel made by Isaiah (comp. § 67, Note 10), and by other prophets; so that *Delitzsch*, *ibid.* p. 307, remarks, "It is undisputed that Joel stands in the relative position of a model which is copied by the entire prophetic ministry of the age of Uzziah and Jeroboam; and from Amos onward there is scarcely a prophet in whom we fail to meet with reminiscences of Joel."

(5) Agreeing with this, on the whole, there are *Credner*, p. 41 ff.; *Movers*, d. bibl. Chronik. p. 119 ff.; *Hitzig*, Vorbemerk. z. Joel, pp. 65–6; *Ewald*, i. pp. 65–6; *Hofmann*, Weissagung u. Erfüllung, i. p. 202; *Meier*, Joel, p. 16; *Baur*, Amos, p. 28; *Winer*, bibl. Real-Wörterbuch, i. p. 585; and last of all, *Delitzsch*, *ibid.*, where he makes the following general remark which deserves attention, p. 308: "The judgment which (as a prelude to the final judgment of the nations) overtook those nations who had formed an alliance to annihilate Israel in the time of Jehoshaphat, and, on the other hand, the fate of being plundered and enslaved, which Judah and Jerusalem endured under Joram, and by which, next to the bloody revolt of Edom, the climax was reached of the disgrace to which Jerusalem was subjected by neighbouring nations which had hitherto been subject or friendly,—these occurrences came to be afterwards thrust aside from the national

consciousness by similar ones of greater importance; but in Joel they still stand in such preponderance, because unparalleled and fresh in the recollection of all, forming the foreground of his prophecy, as to leave no doubt that we must seek for the time of Joel's prophetic work between Joram and Uzziah."

[*Bleek*, pp. 528–531, follows *Abarbanel*, *Vitringa* (Typus doctrinæ proph., an appendix to the Hypotyposis historiæ et chronol. sacræ), *Eichhorn*, *Rosenmüller*, *von Cölln* (de Joelis ætate, Marpurgi 1811), *Knobel*, *De Wette*, and others, in thinking it most probable that he was a contemporary of Amos in the reign of Uzziah, though somewhat earlier,—at most about ten years before him. He observes the similarity of the description of the plague of locusts in Joel and in Amos iv. 6–9,—amongst other things the use of the name גָּזָם for them by both prophets,—and the close parallel between the prophecies, Joel iv. 4–6 and Amos i. 6–10. The three prophets, Hosea, Joel, and Amos, have indeed very many points of resemblance, such as would well suit contemporaries. In reply to the argument, that the composition must have been previous to Hazael's attack upon Jerusalem, of which it makes no mention, he justly says this is of no weight except against the supposition that the book was written *soon* after that attack; whereas, on the old and still common supposition which *Bleek* adopts, half a century had elapsed, in the course of which that event might have passed out of notice: all the more so, we may add, considering that Syria does not seem to have become hostile to the kingdom of Judah till the times of Jotham and Ahaz, though it had long been an enemy of the Ten Tribes, and that Hazael's expedition, as against Jerusalem, seems to have been an exceptional occurrence, and is spoken of in Scripture as rather incidental. The language in iv. 2, that the nations have scattered Israel among the nations, and have parted Jehovah's land, does not correspond with anything in history earlier than the desolations by the Assyrians and Babylonians, and is quite unfavourable to the very early date which *Keil* assigns to the prophecy. *Delitzsch's* method of connecting Joel's judgment of all nations in the valley of Jehoshaphat with Jehoshaphat's victory over the allied nations (2 Chron. xx.), may or may not be correct. Granting it to be so, this does nothing to determine whether the date of the prophecy was some fifty or some hundred years subsequent to that victory, so long as new and more important political combinations adverse to Judah had not occurred. *Keil's* assertion that Amos i. 3–5 threatens Syria for the attack upon Jerusalem, seems entirely unwarranted, if it be not rather in direct contradiction to the words of the prophecy, which explicitly connect the

threatening with the misdeeds of Syria in Gilead; nor are we entitled to assume that Amos prophesied so early as the year of Uzziah's accession, while a later date would leave time for him to imitate Joel. With reference to the uncertainty of the arguments for the very early date assigned recently to some of the minor prophets, comp. the additional remarks at the end of § 81. Besides, the time from Amaziah's expedition against Edom, his idolatry, and his reverses, may have given opportunity for the hostile feelings of the nations around.]

To this age [whether half a century earlier or later is of no importance to this observation] also correspond the classical form of the prophecy, and the genuinely poetical language of the prophet's discourse; that language being at the same time free from any appearance of copying, and everywhere being pure, simple, and easy (6).

(6) *Ewald*, p. 68: "Nothing distinguishes this prophet's language so much from that of every other, as this stream of the discourse, so deep and full, and yet so easy and pleasant."

§ 85. *The Book of Joel.*

The occasion of the prophecy of Joel was an entire desolation of Judah by an unheard-of plague of locusts, accompanied by a burning drought, which lasted for several years (ii. 25). The *first* half of it (i. 2–ii. 18) contains a call to repentance, urged by the prophet with ever increasing urgency in the midst of the fearful plague on the land, which had been already threatened in the law (Deut. xxiii. 38, 39) against the transgressors as a punishment from God. The *second* half (ii. 19–iv. 21) contains the divine promise, not only of the removal of this judgment, and of the judgment upon all the nations hostile to the theocracy, but also of the glorification of the theocracy, through the bestowal of the richest natural blessings, and through the outpouring of the Spirit of God upon all flesh (1). The two halves are closely bound together into one whole by the historical remark which stands between them (ii. 19), "And Jehovah answered, and said unto His people." Accordingly, the prediction of the future does not begin till ii. 19*b*, [though the translation in the English version seems quite defensible]. In the first half the prophet does not foretell some future misfortune and some judgment still impending over the theocracy at the hands of armies of hostile nations, under the

allegorical veil of a swarm of locusts laying the land waste; but he depicts a present judgment already come, the abiding frightful plague of locusts laying everything waste, in which he beholds the forerunners of the day of Jehovah which is near (i. 15, ii. 1, 2), though it may still be averted by thoroughgoing repentance (i. 13, 14, ii. 1, 12, 13, 15 ff.) (2).

(1) *Ewald*, p. 60, and *Delitzsch*, p. 313, make the first half extend only to ii. 17, and make the intermediate historical remark begin with ver. 18. Nevertheless, a comparison with vers. 12–14 is favourable to the combination of ver. 18 with the summons to repentance, as a promise of divine assistance; for certainly in those verses there is already a hint of such a promise as a possible consequence of repentance. It is clear at once, from ver. 23, that the Vav consecutive in וַיְקַנֵּא does not forbid such a combination.

(2) The allegorical interpretation of the host of locusts, which, latest of all, *Hengstb.* p. 344 ff., and *Häv.* p. 291 ff., following the *Chaldee*, *Ephrem Syrus*, *Jerome*, and others [*Bleek*, p. 526-7, names also *Cyril* of Alexandria, *Abarbanel*, *Luther*, *Grotius*, *Bertholdt;* and against it, *Raschi*, *Aben Ezra*, *David Kimchi*, as also certain Jewish expositors so early as the time of *Jerome*, and most moderns following *Bochart*], have defended as alone correct, stands or falls with the question whether Joel describes a present or a future calamity in i. 2–ii. 17. [*Bleek*, *ibid.*, says it was understood as a prediction by *Theodoret*, followed by many later expositors; whereas it was understood to delineate a present scene by *Luther* and *Calvin*, as it is by most of the more recent expositors.] Decisive against the supposition that it is a prediction, and in favour of its being a description of the present, is the fact not only that the prophet from the beginning (i. 2 ff.) represents the desolation of the land by the locusts as a present calamity, and on this ground calls the people to repentance, but also that he never gives a hint that he is speaking of things future. For though he designates the day of Jehovah as near at hand, i. 15 and ii. 1, this does not prove that the desolation by the locusts which he depicts is still impending in the future, but only that it is a forerunner of the approaching day of Jehovah, or of the final judgment. [*Bleek*, p. 527, quite takes this view, else "the prophet would certainly not have given the foremost place to this circumstance, that the host had laid waste the vine and the fig-tree with the teeth of lions, and stripped them utterly bare, and left the branches white, i. 6, 7; comp. vers. 12, 17–20: just as little would the desolating hosts have been then described as in appearance *like* horses, and as running *like* horsemen,

ii. 4, as running *like* mighty men, as climbing the wall *like* men of war, ii. 7, and as entering in at the windows *like* a thief," ii. 9.] To take such a picture as a prediction of future events would be a step without the support of any analogy among the prophets. Also the passages ii. 17, 20, on which reliance is especially placed to establish the allegorical interpretation, are not decisive. For לִמְשָׁל־בָּם גּוֹיִם (ver. 17) is not a certain proof that the locusts are a figure of the nations, since neither the *usus loquendi* nor the context necessarily demand that מָשַׁל be taken in the sense "to rule over:" much rather does the connection favour the sense "to use a byword against;" and this use of the word is not confined to Ezekiel (Ezek. xii. 23, xvi. 44, etc.), but has also in its favour so early a passage as Num. xxi. 27. And since the migratory locust (*Oken's* acridium migratorium) is to be met with in Irak, in Syria, and in the Syrian desert, swarms of them might be brought from that desert into Judea by the north-east wind, and therefore be designated by the word הַצְּפוֹנִי (ii. 20), "the northern." —Even the passages in the later prophets, in which what Joel has said of the locusts is transferred to hostile nations, afford no decisive argument in favour of the allegorical interpretation; for the prophets have often reproduced freely the words of their predecessors, only applying them to their own time. Comp. *Delitzsch*, p. 309 ff., *Auberlen* in *Herzog's* Real-Encycl. vi. p. 719 f.; and for the history of the interpretation, the commentaries of *Pococke*, *Marck*, and *Credner*. [It is unnecessary here to enter at length into a discussion on the interpretation of this prophecy: yet it is right to say that there are considerations to be taken into account, which make the determination of the question by no means so easy as *Keil* seems to think, and which led *Umbreit*, in his commentary, to acknowledge that he had often wavered between the two opinions, and had ended by thinking that the prophet meant to include both. Certainly it is easily conceivable that plagues of natural locusts may have severely afflicted the people during those reigns which present a very chequered history, connected with very unsteady religious profession, the reigns of Joash, Amaziah, and Uzziah, which followed the wicked reigns of Joram, Ahaziah, and Athaliah; and in this case, any messenger of God might recall to the minds of the people that Moses had threatened locusts, along with other evils—captivity among the rest—in case of their disobedience, Deut. xxviii. 38–42; and that Solomon had mentioned locusts and captivity in succession among the threatened evils which he deprecated and taught the people to pray against, in his own prayer at the dedication of the temple (1 Kings viii. 37, 46). But the prophets—those at least whose writings stand in the canonical Scriptures—began

to appear contemporaneously with the providential agencies which gave rise to those great monarchies of the world that became the instruments of God's judgment on the theocracy of the Old Testament, and of preparing the way for the theocracy as it is revealed in the New Testament: see *Keil's* own statement in § 63, which we think agrees best with the later date proposed for Joel. It is no wonder if his prophetic eye detected the instruments of divine vengeance in the great Assyrian monarchy, which he named "the *northern* army," in language that became classical with succeeding prophets, till it appears continually in the writings of Jeremiah, who saw the judgment executed; whereas this designation "northern" is doubtfully applicable by a bare possibility to locusts coming into Judea, and certainly is an epithet most unlikely to be selected for them. Joel would then connect the well-known and frequently predicted outward plague of locusts with that worse calamity, locust-hosts of enemies, who were to desolate the land, and then to carry the people captive from it,—a symbolical representation very easily apprehended by any class of men, most of all by the nations of Syria and the neighbouring countries; perhaps already suggested in the earliest books of Scripture by the language, "And I will send *hornets* before thee, which shall drive out the Hivite, the Canaanite, and the Hittite, from before thee" (Ex. xxiii. 28, comp. Deut. vii. 20, Josh. xxiv. 12); and certainly taken up in other prophetic writings from Amos (who joins locusts and fire, vii. 1, 4, as Joel does) down to John in Rev. ix. 1–12. The objection that it is unfair to argue from these confessedly symbolical passages, is scarcely warrantable on the part of those who (like *Keil*) unhesitatingly take Hos. i.–iii. to be purely symbolical; at all events, it is of no force as against those who reckon the entire book of Joel to be manifestly symbolical (as in point of fact Joel describes *dreams* and *visions* as the ordinary form of prophecy, ch. iii. 1), from the vine and the fig-tree at the beginning, the standing images for the church, on to the end, where the mountains and hills are represented dropping and flowing with new wine and milk, and a fountain coming forth from the house of Jehovah and watering the torrent-bed of Shittim after the conclusion of the harvest and vintage of wrath (i. 7, iv. 13, 18). This consideration also meets the difficulty started in the quotation from *Bleek:* these expressions, like גּוֹי, i. 6, עַם, ii. 2, אִישׁ and גֶּבֶר, ii. 8, are intentional, to let the reality here and there show itself through the veil of symbol, and to assure the reader that it is a symbolical description, locusts in a vision, which the prophet discovers to be armed men. And thus, though the description of the locusts is perfect and true to nature in every respect, it is not quite such a

description as we might expect, if mere natural locusts were intended: for instance, the comparison of their teeth to the teeth of *lions*, which more naturally suggests warrior hosts, and the circumstance that no notice is taken of their flight, always a most prominent feature, unless possibly it be in the darkness of the day of Jehovah; yet, if so, this amounts to a concession that the visitation of locusts and the day of Jehovah are one and the same thing, as indeed we believe they are mixed up inseparably, ii. 1–11; in which case, however, it becomes impossible (with *Keil*) to speak of the actually present natural locusts as forerunners of the day of Jehovah, which is something different. And again, locusts are carried away by the wind, as they are brought by it—they move helplessly as it carries them along; but in ii. 20, a passage with which it is interesting to compare and contrast Ezek. xxxix. 11 ff., these locusts are swept away at once in two opposite directions to the Mediterranean and to the Dead Sea, and perhaps in a third direction towards the southern desert. Once more, the translation of ii. 17, "Spare Thy people, Jehovah, and give not Thine heritage to reproach, that the heathen should rule over them," is simple enough, suiting every requirement of the interpreter, and with a natural reference to the normal state of matters, which would have been precisely the reverse, Deut xv. 6; but the translation that is unavoidable in order to avoid the metaphorical interpretation of the locusts, "that the heathen should use a byword against them," is at least questionable in its grammatical construction and usage of language,—it is certainly opposed to all traditionary authority in the translations,—and it is not very intelligible, since it is hard to see why the people should be reproached and made a byword among the heathen on account of a mere natural calamity, a calamity in which these surrounding heathen would be almost certain to have their share.—The fact seems to be that Joel, the earliest of the prophetic writers in the kingdom of Judah, as Hosea was the earliest in the kingdom of Israel, foresees and announces the invasions of the great heathen powers, ending in the captivity of which he plainly and fully speaks at iv. 1, 2, 17. He sees the divine protection removed from God's ancient people, who therefore sink to the level of the heathen (comp. Amos ix. 7), nay, who change places with the enemies of God, and become exposed to the concluding and most severe of the plagues of Egypt (comp. Deut. xxviii. 59, 60),—fire, locusts, and darkness all combined (comp. locusts and fire successively, Am. vii. 1, 4, after which the Lord Himself smites). Yet grace prevails to save them from the final stroke, which is averted from them, and falls upon their enemies, "*the* nations" (iv. 2, where the article implies that they had

been already mentioned, which they had not been, unless the locusts were their emblem), but who in the last chapter are gathered for destruction; while the covenant people, blessed in the first instance with the gift of the promised Saviour, and afterwards with the showers of the Spirit (ii. 23, iii. 1), enjoy the presence of their God and all good things which He can bestow in a land flowing with milk and new wine, answering to the "milk and honey" of the Pentateuch.]

As the book of Joel contains a prophetic discourse combined into an internal and external unity, there is no apparent reason for denying that the prophet was the publisher of his own writings. But we have not the means of deciding whether it contains only one "section taken from his prophetic working," or whether it comprises "this very working itself in what was properly its central and its highest point" (3).

(3) This only is certain, that nothing more of Joel's prophecies has reached posterity; and that the passage in Mic. iv. 1–3 and Isa. ii. 2–4 is not a fragment of a prediction of this prophet which came to be lost, as *Ewald* and *Hitzig* believe.

III. AMOS (עָמוֹס).

Commentaries:—*Jo. Gerhardi*, Adnotatt. posth. in prophetas Amos et Jonam (along with his Adnotatt. in Psalm. quinque priores), Jenæ 1663 and 1676, 4to. Amos proph. expositus, interpr. nova Latina . . . ampliss. commentario . . . illustratus, etc., cura atque stud. *J. Chr. Harenberg*, Lugduni Batavorum 1763, 4to. Translations and expositions by *J. C. W. Dahl*, Göttingen 1795; *Justi*, Leipzig 1799. *J. S. Vater*, Amos übersetzt u. erläutert mit Beifüg. des hebr. Textes und des Grieches der LXX., nebst Anmerkk. zu. letzterem, Halle 1810 (also with the Latin title, Oracula Amosi, etc.). *Gust. Baur*, der Proph. Amos erklärt, Giessen 1847.

Juynboll, dissert. de Amoso, Lugduni Batavorum 1828.

§ 86. *The Person of the Prophet.*

Amos, a shepherd of Tekoah, in the kingdom of Judah, a simple and uneducated man (vii. 14), yet not in the sense of being destitute

of cultivation or unacquainted with writing (1), was called by the Lord to be a prophet, in order that in Bethel, the principal seat of the worship of the calves, he might rebuke the kingdom of the Ten Tribes for their sins. He prophesied under Uzziah and Jeroboam II. —that is, in the latter half of the reign of Jeroboam [not earlier than his twenty-seventh year, 2 Kings xv. 1], ch. i. 1, vii. 10, between the years B.C. 810 and 783 (2), that is to say, shortly before [?] Hosea. At this time the kingdom of Israel, under Jeroboam, had attained its greatest extent; and worldly power, luxury, and debauchery had misled the people into careless security (iii. 15, vi. 1, 4 ff.), so that unrighteousness prevailed (ii. 6 ff., iii. 9 ff., iv. 1, v. 7, 10 ff.), and hurried on the ruin of the kingdom,—which Amos announced (v. 2, 3, 27, vi. 14, vii. 9, etc.), to the very great offence of the priests at Bethel, who did not choose to endure the troublesome preacher's rebuke.—Nothing further is known of his life (3).

(1) [*Bleek*, p. 532, observes that the name occurs nowhere in the Old Testament except in his own book, i. 1, vii. 8 ff., viii. 2. A manifest blunder, committed by those who identified him with the father of the prophet Isaiah, has been already noticed, § 64, Note 1.] The attempts of some of the ancients to make him out an Ephraimite are untenable. Comp. *Baur*, p. 41 ff. Also the opinion of many recent writers, that he was a wealthy owner of flocks, and that he pretty early found himself in such favourable circumstances that he obtained a cultivation superior to his station (*Bertholdt*, iv. p. 1612), is without foundation. The word נוֹקֵד (i. 1) does certainly also mean a breeder of sheep or a possessor of large flocks of sheep (2 Kings iii. 4); but that Amos was not such a person, but only a simple herdsman, is clear from vii. 14 f., according to which he herded the sheep and nourished himself upon sycamores, which served as nourishment only for the common people. Comp. *Bochart*, Hieroz. i. p. 407, ed. *Rosenmüller*, and *Häv.* Einl. ii. 2, pp. 304–5. The knowledge of the law and of the earlier prophets which is manifested in his prophecies (comp. § 34, Note 15, and § 84, Note 4) does not presuppose any learned education; nor is it at variance with his own assertion, that at the time of his call he was neither a prophet nor a prophet's scholar (vii. 14); that is to say, he had not before lain under the obligation of the prophet's call, nor had any special preparation for such a thing. His prophetic work is purely the fruit of his divine call; which, however, does not exclude the natural gift of

oratory, nor acquaintance with the Holy Scriptures of his people. With all this it also remains true: "Deum qui humilia elegit, et quæ vilia sunt in mundo atque contempta nobilibus præfert (1 Cor. i. 26–7), Amosi quoque exemplo testatum facere voluisse, non generis splendore, aut dignitate, aut literarum peritia, non humano consilio vel industria comparari, sed divino munere ac gratia prophetiæ donum pariter ac officium obtingere, quo tam rudes ac simplices instruere quam nobiles ac doctos pro lubito suo Spiritus S. soleat" (*Carpzov*, p. 318). Comp. *Baur*, p. 50 ff.

(2) From the statement, "two years before the earthquake," i. 1, we are unable to determine more precisely the time at which Amos appeared, as we know nothing more about this earthquake than that it happened in Uzziah's reign (Zech. xiv. 5), and the rabbinical determinations of the date rest upon uncertain combinations and traditions. Comp. *Baur*, p. 58, note. In other respects the statement in the superscription is confirmed by the contents of the book. Not only is Jeroboam mentioned in vii. 10; but also there are references to his time in vi. 2 and 14, comp. with 2 Kings xiv. 25, and to the time of Uzziah in the fall of the city of Gath, which he mentions, vi. 2, comp. with 2 Chron. xxvi. 6; as also ix. 12, comp. with i. 12, presupposes something like the conquest of Sela, the capital of Edom, by Uzziah's father, Amaziah, 2 Kings xiv. 7. Comp. *Baur*, p. 66. [The last instance seems very doubtful. *Bleek*, p. 533, thinks that the statement, "two years before the earthquake," restricts the utterances of the book of Amos to that single year; and he conjectures that his public ministry may not have lasted any longer. "When Amos received the divine command, he must have left his home, and in general the land of Judah, and betaken himself to the kingdom of Israel; and we may conjecture that at a later time he returned thence to his own home."]

(3) See apocryphal accounts of his death in the *pseudo-Epiphanius*, c. 12, and *pseudo-Dorotheus*, in *Carpzov*, p. 319, and *Baur*, p. 54 ff.

His prophetic discourse is distinguished by great clearness and regularity, liveliness and force; by a well-rounded rhythm, occurring at regular intervals, once rising into strophical arrangement (i. ii.); by many peculiar, fresh, and beautiful images, taken from nature and from pastoral life (4); and by pure and beautiful language, deviating only in its orthography, which reminds us of the somewhat vulgar pronunciation of the herdsman (5).

(4) *Ewald*, i. p. 84. "Nowhere else in the prophets do we meet with images from country life in such pure originality and liveliness, and in such inexhaustible fulness." See the collection of these images in *Baur*, p. 122 ff.

(5) For instance, מֵעִיק for מֵצִיק, ii. 13; בּוֹסֵס for בּוֹסֵם, v. 11; מְתָאֵב for מְתָעֵב, vi. 8; מְסָרֵף for מְשָׂרֵף, vi. 10; יִשְׂחָק for יִצְחָק, vii. 16; נְשָׂקָה for נְשָׁקָעָה, viii. 8; also the spelling דָּוִיד, vi. 5, ix. 11 (like Hos. iii. 5). [*Bleek*, p. 534, note, is inclined to think הַהַרְמוֹנָה, iv. 3, means "towards Hermon," in which case there would be another peculiar spelling, with ה for ח. But since these peculiarities are all in orthography, p. 536, he thinks that even the guarded criticism of *Jerome*, procem. in Amos, is in want of further limitation, "imperitum sermone, sed non scientia." And in this view of the language he follows *De Wette*, § 234, Anm. *b*, and *Ewald*, Proph. i. p. 84.] Against one-sided judgments, which rest more upon the previous condition of Amos than upon his book as it lies before us, *Lowth*, de poesi sacr., ed. Michael., p. 433, remarks, "Evolvat modo scripta ejus æquus judex, de re, non de homine quæsiturus; censebit, credo, potius pastorem nostrum, *μηδὲν ὑστερηκέναι τῶν ὑπερλίαν προφητῶν*, ut sensuum elatione et magnificentia spiritus prope summis parem, ita etiam dictionis splendore et compositionis elegantia vix quoquam inferiorem." Comp. also *Baur*, p. 119 ff.

§ 87. *The Book of Amos.*

The prophecies of Amos, directed principally against the kingdom of the Ten Tribes, are combined in his book into a beautifully arranged and carefully rounded whole, according to a well-digested plan (1); the *first* part, ch. i.–vi., containing simple prophetical discourses, and the *second*, ch. vii.–ix., containing visions, and a symbolical announcement.—He begins with an introduction, depicting the judgment which goes forth from Zion: it not only lights upon all the surrounding kingdoms, on account of their sinning against the theocracy,—it also touches Judah, and it remains hanging over Israel (i. 2–ii. 16). Then in *three* connected discourses, with ever increasing force and precision, the prophet foretells to all Israel (iii. 1, vi. 1), but in particular to the secure and hardened sinners of Samaria (iii. 12, iv. 1, v. 1), the judgment of the destruction of the kingdom, and the captivity (iv.–vi.) [or iii.–vi.?]. Then he sets this punishment before the eyes of the people in several visions, which assume

ever a more and more threatening appearance, in respect both of their form and of their subject-matter (vii. 1–ix. 10); so that only at the conclusion, in a few powerful words, he announces the glorification of the theocracy, which is to be introduced after the judgment (ix. 11–15) (2).

(1) Wholly erroneous are the attempts of *Harenberg*, *Dahl*, and others, to divide the individual discourses and portions of the book, according to the time at which they were uttered. Against this, comp. *Hengstb.* Christol. i. p. 408 ff., *Häv.* p. 310 ff., *De Wette*, § 233, *Baur*, p. 110 ff.—Also *Knobel's* assumption (der Prophetismus, ii. p. 150) is untenable, that ch. iii–vi. contain the discourses delivered by Amos at Bethel, and that ch. vii. 10–17 does not stand in its right place, but belongs to the end of ch. vi. So also is the opinion of *Ewald* (i. p. 87), and of *Baur* (p. 111 ff.), that the prophet's original utterances lie before us in the visions, vii.–ix. 10; the reasons for which he laid down, and brought into connection with the whole of the theological view of the world, in the wider amplification contained in ch. iii.–vi., after his return to Judah at a later time. For the three visions, vii. 1–9, torn loose from the connection in which they stand with the first part, want a suitable motive to explain them; consequently they cannot have been uttered without the preceding rebukes and threatenings which we read in ch. iii.–vi. Comp. *Häv.* p. 312.

(2) That ch. i. 2–ii. 16 should be regarded, not as the first principal part, but as the introduction, is shown by its contents. Proceeding from Joel iv. 16, Amos announces the judgment on the nations, not for some offences selected by way of example (*Jahn*, Einl. ii. p. 404), but for peculiar offences committed against the theocracy; and his aim is to show to Israel, that when the very heathen must meet with punishment for their sin against the living God, the covenant people themselves had incurred a judgment all the more severe on account of their continued ungodliness. Comp. *Hengstb.* p. 410 ff. The following discourses and visions are only the further amplification of the judgment denounced against Israel in this introduction. And therefore we ought to understand the relation of ch. i.–vi. to ch. vii.–ix. in this way: that the *first* part already presents the sum or essence of the prophet's active labours in the kingdom of the Ten Tribes, while the *second* part repeats them more according to their gradual unfolding; and thus we have the explanation of the insertion of the historical notice about the hostile treatment which he met with at Bethel (vii. 10 ff.), in the middle of the otherwise closely con-

nected series of visions.—*Ewald*, p. 111 f., is also wrong in separating the last section, from ch. viii. 4 onwards, as if the circle of the visions at Bethel was finished at viii. 3, and what follows was not annexed till after his return to Judah, by way of explanation. Against this, comp. *Häv.* p. 313 f.

Now, since the writings of Amos form a closely connected whole, well proportioned and adjusted in all its parts, undoubtedly the prophet himself composed it after the execution of his mission in Bethel, in order to transmit to posterity the essential contents of his prophecies. And the chronological remark in the superscription, "two years before the earthquake," is particularly in favour of this view (3).

(3) [See above, § 86, Note 2, for some observations on these words.] That this statement has not merely a chronological significance, but that the earthquake in Uzziah's reign was to the prophet a forerunner of the impending judgment, and at the same time, along with this, the occasion of his setting his prophecies down in writing, has been correctly acknowledged by *Häv.* p. 314 f.

IV. OBADIAH (עֹבַדְיָה) [OR, AS IN THE TITLE, עובדיה].

Commentaries:—Obadias Ebr. et Chald. etc. auct. *Jo. Leusden;* see above in § 86. *Aug. Pfeiffer*, Comm. in Obad. . . . exh. vers. Lat. et examen commentarii Is. Abarbanel, etc., Vitebergæ 1666, 2d ed. 1670, 4to. Der Prophet Obadias aus der bibl. u. weltl. Historie erläutert u. mit theol. Anmerkk. vers. von *J. G. Schröer*, Breslau 1766. *Chr. Fr. Schnurrer*, Dissertat. philol. in Obadiam, Tubingæ 1787, 4to, in his Dissertatt. phil. critt., Gothæ 1790, p. 383. *J. T. G. Holzapfel*, Obadiah neu übersetzt u. erläutert, Rint. 1798. *H. Venemæ*, Lectt. in Obad., with additions by *Verschuir* and *Lotze*, in *Verschuiri* Opusc. ed. *Lotze*, Ultrajecti 1810. *C. L. Hendewerk*, Obadiæ Proph. oraculum in Idumæos, Regiomonte 1836. Der. Proph. Obadja ausgelegt, v. *C. P. Caspari*, Leipzig 1842.

For Introduction:—*G. F. Jäger*, üb. d. Zeitalter Obadja's, Tübingen 1837, 4to. *Fr. Delitzsch*, wann weissagte Obadja? In *Rudelbach* und *Guericke's* Zeitschrift, 1851, p. 91 ff.

§ 88. *Contents and Date of his Prophecy.*

We are entirely destitute of historical information as to the person of Obadiah (1). That he was a Jew is shown by his prophecy, which treats of the relations of Edom to the theocracy. There are three connected topics in it, as he announces the certainty of Edom's overthrow (vers. 1–9); the cause of this overthrow, the guilt of Edom in consequence of its bitter enmity to the theocracy (vers. 10–16); and the glorification of the theocracy, and its victory over Edom.

(1) Traditional legends about him, entirely unauthenticated, may be seen in *Carpzov*, pp. 338 sqq., *Caspari*, p. 2 ff., and *Delitzsch*, de Habacuci proph. vita, etc., p. 60 sq. [*Bleek*, p. 536, rightly rejects the fancy of *Augusti* that Obadiah ought not to be considered a proper name, but should be translated "the prophecy of a certain godly person." He notices that in the Vatican codex of the Septuagint, and elsewhere, the name is written Ὀβδίας, but in the Alexandrian codex, and by the Alexandrian Fathers, it is written Ἀβδίας, which form appears in the Latin Bible. In the title of the Hebrew Bible, though not in the superscription, ver. 1, it is spelt עובדיה.]

The time at which he lived is much disputed (2). We infer from a comparison of vers. 1–9 with Jer. xlix. 7–22, that he prophesied before the destruction of Jerusalem by the Chaldees (3). If we also take into account the absence of any allusion to the destruction and burning of Jerusalem, and to the Babylonian exile, the mention of the entire "captivity of this host of the children of Israel" among [?] "the Canaanites unto Zarephath," and "the captivity of Jerusalem which is in Sepharad" (ver. 20) (4), and the unmistakeable way in which Joel leans upon him (5); then the rebuke of the wickedness of Edom (ver. 10 ff.) cannot be referred to utterances of malicious joy openly expressed by Edom against the people of their brother Judah during the Chaldean catastrophe; but the whole description of the misfortune which overtook Judah and Jerusalem (vers. 11–14) must refer only to the taking and plundering of Jerusalem in the reign of Joram, when a great part of the people were carried away into slavery among the Canaanites and the Greeks (2 Chron. xxi. 16–17; comp. with Joel iv. 3–6, Am. i. 6, 9) (6). It follows from this, that Obadiah prophesied before Joel, while Joram was still reigning, that is, about

B.C. 889–884: and "there is nothing whatever against this in the circumstance that he himself composed his prophecy in writing; while in favour of it there is this, that till then, in the history of prophecy, materials had not been forthcoming for such a thing, and for working it up in the form of a threatening address to the nation hostile to Israel" (7).

(2) Comp. *Caspari*, pp. 4, 5.—*Jäger*, p. 50 f., *Hengstb.* Bileam, p. 253 ff.; and Christol. i. pp. 458–9, *Caspari*, p. 35 ff., *Häv.* p. 321, and others, place him in the reign of Uzziah; *Vitringa* (typ. doctr. proph. p. 35 sq.), *Carpzov*, p. 342, *Küper* (Jerem. pp. 104 sq.), in that of Ahaz; *Aben Ezra*, *Luther*, *Calov*, *J. H. Machaelis*, *Schnurrer*, and many recent writers, are of opinion that he prophesied immediately after the destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar. [*Bleek*, p. 537, holds this opinion; and he pronounces the predictive view of *Häv.*, *Caspari*, and *Hengstb.*, on the one side, to be as perverted as that of *Hitzig* on the other.] *Hitzig* holds him to be an Egyptian Jew, who wrote shortly after B.C. 312; a similar opinion with reference to vers. 17–21 having been already maintained by *Eichhorn*, Einl. iv. p. 323 ff. On the contrary, *Hofmann* (Weissagung u. Erfullung, i. p. 201) and *Delitzsch*, *ibid.*, hold that he prophesied under Joram; and the latter conjectures that he may have been the prince under Jehoshaphat who is mentioned in 2 Chron. xvii. 7.

(3) There is no controversy as to the affinity of the two passages. And Obadiah is not dependent on Jeremiah, as *Bertholdt*, p. 1631, *v. Cölln* (Allg. Lit. Zeitung, 1828, Erg. Bl. xvi. 122, and bibl. Theol. p. 55), *Credner* (Joel, p. 87), *Hitzig*, p. 141, and others, suppose, [including *Bleek*, pp. 537–8, owing to his opinion that Obadiah prophesied after the destruction of Jerusalem; and because he speaks so much of the hostility of Edom towards Israel and Judah, of which there is nothing in Jeremiah]; but is original, and has been used by Jeremiah. This is the opinion of *Eichhorn*, *Schnurrer*, *Rosenmüller*, *Jäger*, *Hendewerk*, *Maurer*, *Hengstb. ibid.*, *Küper*, p. 100 sqq., *Caspari*, p. 5 ff., and in *Rudelbach* u. *Guericke's* Zeitschrift, 1843, ii. pp. 11, 12, *Häv.* pp. 320–1, and *Delitzsch*, p. 94. Decisive reasons may be given for it. (*a.*) That in almost all his prophecies against the nations, Jeremiah has blended older prophecies now approaching their nearer and more complete fulfilment. (*b.*) That there is not found in Obadiah a single one of all Jeremiah's peculiar and characteristic expressions, such as occur in his prophecy against Edom (for instance, comp. Jer. xlix. 13 with xxii. 5, xxiv. 9, xxv. 9, etc.); while, on the contrary, nothing appears elsewhere in Jeremiah of all that he has in common with

Obadiah, but rather it bears the stamp of something foreign, which proceeds from a different source. (*c.*) That the prophecy of Obadiah forms a well-arranged whole, with internal and necessary progress, and with a homogeneous formation; on the contrary, in Jeremiah there is no advance on the plan of development, but a series of heterogeneous elements in the announcement of judgment, like the links in a chain. (*d.*) That the comparison of the individual differences between the two texts in general, brings to light the originality of Obadiah, and the imitation on the side of Jeremiah.—The hypothesis of *Augusti*, Einl. § 222, *Krahmer*, observatt. in Obad. 1833, *Ewald*, i. p. 399, and *E. Meier* in *Zeller's* Jahrbb. i. 3, p. 526, that Obadiah, as well as Jeremiah, had made use of a passage from an older prophet, is superfluous, and it has been refuted by *Caspari*, Obad. p. 23 ff., and *Delitzsch*, p. 95. [*Bleek*, p. 537, note, characterizes it as "little probable."]

(4) Neither does the description of the misfortune which befell Jerusalem and the nation (vers. 11–14) relate to the destruction of Jerusalem and the ruin of the kingdom, since בְּיוֹם אֲבָדָם does not take for granted the ruin of the entire nation, but only that of many of the בְּנֵי יְהוּדָה: nor in the promise (vers. 17–21) is there to be found an allusion to the exile of the entire nation (in Assyria or Babylonia); but the inhabitants of the individual divisions of Judah were to take possession of the territory of their enemies (ver. 19), and the גָּלוּת (that is, the entire body of the captives) among the Canaanites, and in Sepharad (that is, Sparta), should possess the cities of the south. Comp. *Delitzsch*, p. 97 ff. [Sepharad is a very obscure word, certainly: a discovery of *Lassen's*, after *Burnouf*, in reading a cuneiform inscription given by *Niebuhr*, has led to its being now reckoned by many to be a satrapy of the Persian empire,—*Lassen*'s latest opinion being, that it is Lydia, so called from its capital, Svarda or Sardis. See *Gesenius*, Thesaurus, *sub voce*, and *Roediger's* additions. On the subject of this note, however, see the addition to Note 7.]

(5) Comp. the accord in the following utterances: Joel iii. 5 and Ob. ver. 17; Joel iv. 19 and Ob. ver. 10; Joel iv. 3 and Ob. ver. 11; also the correlation between Joel iv. 7, 8 and Ob. ver. 15; and between Joel iv. 17 and Ob. ver. 17 and ver. 11; and many other things in *Jäger*, p. 47 ff., and in *Caspari*, Obad. pp. 20, 21, which put it beyond all doubt that the one is dependent on the other. Joel's dependence in this instance on Obadiah does not conflict with his originality. And it is more probable than the reverse supposition, made by *Jäger*, *Caspari*, *Häv.*, and others, because Obadiah treats of a much more special theme than Joel; and in amplifying so limited a theme, he would scarcely have borrowed so many thoughts and

expressions from Joel. Comp. *Delitzsch*, p. 101. [See addition to Note 7.]—Obadiah has imitated nothing, except in certain passages the prophecies of Balaam (comp. vers. 4 and 18 ff. with Num. xxiv. 21, 18, 19).

(6) Comp. *Hofmann*, Weissagung u. Erfüllung, i. p. 201, and *Delitzsch*, *ibid.* p. 97 ff.

(7) The words of *Delitzsch*, p. 102, who yet compares Obadiah's חָזוֹן concerning Edom with Ahijah's נְבוּאָה, and Jehdi's חָזוּת against Jeroboam I. [2 Chron. ix. 29, where in the English version the latter is called Iddo]; and also on account of the more sensuous externality of its contents, in comparison with the wider survey and more intellectual (or at least more many-sided) apprehension of Joel, he pronounces the book of Obadiah the most ancient monument of that prophecy, whose circle of vision extends as far as the whole course of the future history of the nations of the world. [The statements to which this Note and Note 6 refer, in regard to the age of Obadiah, and also the attempt in Note 5 to determine, on internal evidence, whether the brief prophecy of Joel has borrowed from the brief prophecy of Obadiah, or whether the reverse has been the case, seem to be good instances of the tendency, in certain even of the best and most cautious recent critics, to rely too much on their own sagacity in discovering internal evidence. Some good remarks on the subject of the date of Obadiah's prophecy, and of the relation between him and Jeremiah which is connected with it, are to be found in *Pusey's* Minor Prophets, on Obadiah. The belief that Obadiah wrote after the destruction of Jerusalem, is probably the more common among ourselves, owing to the mistranslation in the English Bible, in vers. 12–14, where verbs are placed in the past tense which obviously ought to have been in the future or jussive, being negative imperatives, of which a slight hint is given in the margin, "do not behold the day of thy brother," etc.; the verbs in ver. 11 are in the infinitive form, so that the tense can be ascertained only from the context. The reader of the prophecy will probably be disposed to think that there are various references from ver. 10 to the end of the book, which are more suitable to the overthrow and ruin of the city and the state by the Babylonians than to any minor calamity, although the prophet might allude to certain past experiences in the delineation which he gave of the final catastrophe; and though the absence of reference to the taking and burning of the city might be surprising in a person who wrote *after* the event, it is not at all surprising, in the general delineations to be expected in a writer of the age of Uzziah, according to what *Keil* himself has said of Isaiah in § 71, Note 4.

His account of what happened when the Edomites made their inroad into Judah, in the reign of Joram, is not at all borne out by the text in Chronicles; and it is a mere assumption that this passage is to be brought into connection with those quoted from Joel and Amos, involving perhaps the further assumption that he is right in the very early date which he assigns to Joel's prophecy. Whether Joel or Obadiah be the original writer, is surely a doubtful point in criticism; but we might grant that he is right in assigning originality to Obadiah, and yet Joel's ministrations might have commenced earlier than Obadiah's,—a fact which would then have secured him the position of priority in the Book of the Twelve Prophets, in accordance with the principle on which we have suggested, that the collector may have very naturally proceeded, as explained in the additions to § 81, Note 3.]

V. JONAH (יוֹנָה).

Commentaries:—*Jo. Gerhardi*, Annotatt. in proph. Amos et Jonam; see above. Prælectt. in prophetiam Jonæ, etc., auctore *Aug. Pfeiffer*, Vitebergæ 1671, and often, 4to. Jonas illustratus per paraph. Chald., Masoram magnam et parvam, et per trium præstantiss. Rabb., S. Jarchi, Abr. Aben-Ezræ, Dav. Kimchi, textum, punctat., ut et per Michlal Jophi textum non punctat. etc., auct. *Jo. Leusden*, Trajecti 1692. *Jo. Th. Lessing*, Observatt. in vatic. Jonæ et Nahumi, Chemn. 1780. Curarum crit. et exeg. in LXX. viralem vers. vaticiniorum Jonæ spec. i. ii. iii., auct. *Jo. G. Chr. Hoepfner*, Lipsiæ 1787–8, 4to. Der proph. Jonas übersetzt. u. mit erklär. Anmerkk. herausgg. v. *H. A. Grimm*, Düsseldorf 1798. Exkurse zum B. Jonas. ein Beitr. zur Beurth. d. neusten Erklärr. d. Proph. von *Joh. D. Goldhorn*, Leipzig 1803. *G. E. Reindl*, die Sendung des Proph. Jonas nach Ninive, Bamberg 1826.

For Introduction:—*J. H. Verschuir*, Dissert. de argum. libelli Jonæ, et veritate ejus histor., in his Opusc. ed. *J. A. Lotze*. *P. Friedrichsen*, krit. Uebersicht der versch. Ansichten von d. B. Jonas, nebst e. neuen Versuche üb. dasselbe, Leipzig, 2d ed. 1841. [*Bleek*, p. 571, adds *G. F. Jäger*, üb. d. sittich-relig. Endzweck d. B. Jonah, etc., Tübingen 1840, reprinted from the Tübingen Zeitschrift f. Theol. 1840. See also *Fairbairn*, Jonah, Edinburgh 1849.]

§ 89. *Contents and Character of the Book.*

The book of *Jonah*, the son of Amittai, of Gath-hepher in the tribe of Zebulun (i. 1; 2 Kings xiv. 25) (1), contains this prophet's prediction concerning Nineveh, with the preceding and subsequent historical circumstances (2). Its contents are neither pure fiction, allegory, or myth (3); nor yet a prophetic legend, wrought up poetically with a moral and didactic aim, embellished into a miraculous story, and mingled with mythical elements (4): but, with all its miracles, it is to be taken for a true history of deep prophetico-symbolic and typical significance (5).

(1) There is as little reason to doubt of the identity of our prophet with the Jonah the son of Amittai, who is mentioned in 2 Kings xiv. 25, considering that his own name and his father's are the same in both cases (comp. *Delitzsch*, über d. B. Jona, in *Rudelbach* u. *Guericke's* Zeitschrift, 1840, ii. p. 112 ff.), as of his living under Jeroboam II., and uttering in his reign the divine promise mentioned in that passage, although this also has been doubted; comp. *Friedrichsen*, pp. 7, 8. [*Bleek*, p. 569, quite agrees with *Keil* here. He observes also that the proper name does not occur elsewhere in the Old Testament.]

(2) It is analogous to the passages Isa. vii. xxxvi.–xxxix., Jer. xxxiv. xxxvii.–xlii. [Amos vii.] The book is not fragmentary (*Spinoza*, to whom *Carpzov*, p. 357, replies), nor yet does it consist of various parts (*Müller* in *Paulus*, Memor. vi. 167 ff., *Nachtigal* in *Eichhorn*, allg. Biblioth. ix. 2, p. 221 ff.; comp. in reply, *Goldhorn*, Exkurse, p. 64 ff., *Böhme* in *Illgen's* Zeitschrift, vi. 1, p. 196 ff., and *Friedrichsen*, p. 213 ff.). But it forms a connected whole; for the language and the description continue the same throughout, with the exception of the prayer, ch. ii., which in the nature of the case must be distinguished from the historical narrative. Comp. i. 2 with iii. 2; i. 10, 16 with iv. 1; i. 2 with iv. 2; and observe how the beginning and the conclusion harmonize.

(3) It is held to be a fiction by *Semler*, Appar. lib. Vet. Testamenti interpr. p. 269 sq., [who is followed by *Bleek*, p. 573, thinking it purely fictitious, with a didactic-moral aim; though he is certainly mistaken in claiming *Hengstb.* Christol. 2d ed. i. 467–476 for this view, since he defends its historical reality: see the end of Note 5]; *Herder*, Briefe üb. d. Stud. d. Theol. i. p. 136, 2d ed.; *J. D. Michaelis*; *Stäudlin*, neue Beitrr. pp. 224–5; *Meyer*, Hermeneut. d.

Alten. Test. ii. p. 574; *Hitzig*, Klein. Propheten, p. 157 ff.; *E. Meier*, and others. It is held to be an allegory, by *Herm. v. d. Hardt*, in several writings with various modifications (comp. *Friedrichsen*, 79 ff.); *Less*, vermischte Schriften, i. pp. 161–2; *Palmer* in *Scherer's* Archiv. i. p. 93 ff., and others; last of all, *Krahmer*, Schriftforscher (1839), H. i. It is held to be a poetical myth by *Gramberg*, Geschichte der Religionsideen, ii. pp. 508–9; *Frd. Chr. Baur*, der Proph. Jonas, ein Assyrisch-Babylon-symbol, in *Illgen's* Zeitschrift Neue Folge, 1837, i. p. 88 ff. [pronounced by *Bleek*, p. 576, very thoroughly erroneous, and in the highest degree unnatural], and others. It is held to be a parable by *Jahn*, Einl. ii. p. 527 ff., and *Pareau*, instit. interpr. Vet. Testamenti, p. 534.

(4) Following the unsuccessful attempts to set aside the miraculous contents of the book, by taking it to be a dream (*Abarbanel*, *Grimm*), or a vision (*Blasche*, Comm. üb. d. Hebräerbrief, ii. 756), or by philological perversion (*Anton* in *Paulus'* Neu. Repert. iii. p. 36 ff.), [to which may be added, unless it belongs to the class named in Note 2, the opinion of *Bunsen*, rejected as untenable by *Bleek*, p. 577, that ii. 3–10 is a genuine song of the prophet's, composed by him after escaping out of the sea, and that it came to be misunderstood, and thus gave occasion to the shaping of Jonah's history in the form in which we now have it], an indication was given of this view by *Rosenmüller* (Scholia); it was further carried out by *Gesenius* in the Hall. Allgemein Litt. Zeitung, 1813, No. 23, p. 179 ff., and it was adopted by *Bertholdt*, v. p. 2397; *Winer*, bibl. Real-Wörterbuch, i. p. 596; *De Wette*, Einl. § 236; *Knobel*, Prophetismus, ii. p. 369 ff.; *Ewald*, ii. p. 554 ff.; and *Friedrichsen*, p. 272 ff.

(5) It was the prevalent practice to understand this book historically, not only in the Jewish synagogue [*Bleek*, p. 575, says that without a doubt there is a reference, though an incorrect one, made to it by the Greek editor of the book of Tobit, in the Greek edition xiv. 4, but not in the Latin: "I believe what the prophet Jonah spoke concerning Nineveh, that it shall be destroyed"], but also in the Christian Church till the middle of last century; although, according to certain indications in the Fathers, many heathens mocked at this history, and in the fifteenth century *Abarbanel*, relying upon what is said of Jonah falling asleep in the ship, wished the narrative about the fish which swallowed him to be taken for a dream; comp. *Häv.* pp. 326–7.—In more recent times it has also been defended firmly by *Lilienthal*, d. gute Sache d. göttl. Offenbarung, v. p. 263 ff., ix. p. 480 ff.; *Hess*, Geschichte d. Kön. i. p. 321 ff.; *Lüderwald*, üb. Allegorie u. Mythol. in d. Bibel, 1787; *Piper*, dissert. historiam Jonæ

a recentiorum conatibus vindic. sistens, Gryphisvaldiæ 1786, 4to; *Verschuir, l.c.; Steudel* in Bengel's Archiv. ii. 2, p. 401 ff.; *Reindl, ibid.; Sack*, christl. Apologetik, p. 343, 2d ed.; *Häv.* in the Evang. Kirchen Zeitung, 1834, No. 27 ff., and Einl. ii. 2, p. 331 ff.; *Laberenz* de vera l. Jonæ interpretat., Fuldæ 1836; *Delitzsch, ibid.; M. Baumgarten*, "über das Zeichen des Proph. Jonas" in *Rudelbach* u. *Guericke's* Zeitschrift, 1842, ii. p. 1 ff.; *Welte* on *Herbst's* Einl. ii. 2, p. 129 ff.; and *Hengsb.* Christol. i. p. 467 ff. [See also *Fairbairn's* Jonah.]

The historical truth of the whole narrative is at once proved by the many historical and geographical statements of a genuine historical character (6); by the fundamental idea of the book, which excludes everything fictitious; and by the psychologically truthful delineation of the personality of the prophet, as well as of the other persons, the mariners and the Ninevites (7). Besides, there is the testimony borne by the fact of its reception into the Canon, among the prophetical writings; and, in addition to this, by utterances of Christ (8): whereas, the objections raised upon the other side rest partly upon an unjustifiable denial of the miraculous, partly on misunderstandings, unfounded assumptions, and untenable assertions (9); and they can make no pretension to be true—for this simple reason, that the origin, contents, and tendency of the book become incomprehensible, as soon as we reject the historical character of the narrative (10).

(6) The mission of Jonah to the Ninevites is in perfect keeping with the historical relations of his time, in which the first cases occurred of contact between Israel and Assyria (Hos. v. 13, x. 6); and so early as twelve [?] years after Jeroboam's death, in the reign of Menahem, the destruction threatened by the prophet broke in upon the kingdom of Israel, by the instrumentality of Pul the king of Assyria (2 Kings xv. 19. Comp. *Crusius*, hypomn. ad. theol. proph. iii. p. 38 sq.; *Delitzsch*, pp. 113–4).—The description of the greatness of Nineveh, iii. 3, is in harmony with the statements of the classical writers; comp. *Diod. Sic.* ii. 3, and *Höffer*, premier Mémoire sur les ruines de Ninevé, 1850, p. 57. Its deep moral corruption is testified by Nah. iii. 1, Zeph. ii. 13 ff.; and the mourning of man and beast, iii. 5–8, is confirmed as an Asiatic custom by Herod. ix. 24, [being in itself supported by analogous customs of our own in funeral processions]. Comp. *Häv.* ii. 2, p. 352 ff.

(7) The fundamental thought in the book, that Jehovah would show mercy to the heathen also, when they repented (iii. 10, iv. 10), compared with the behaviour of the prophet, who could not accommodate himself to this special participation of the heathen in the grace of God, stands in no less sharp contrast to the spirit of later Judaism, than does the description of the heathen mariners, not praying to their own gods, but fearing the wrath of Jehovah and making supplication to Him, as soon as they hear of Him (i. 5, 9 ff.). [*Bleek*, p. 374, thinks very highly of the spirit of this book, on account of its opposition to the *particularism* of the later Jews; and in this respect he looks on it as making the nearest approach of any of the books of the Old Testament to the universal spirit of Christianity.] The Ninevites believing in God and repenting in sackcloth and ashes, standing out in contrast with the Israelitish prophet fleeing from Jehovah, and even after his own miraculous deliverance still feeling angry at the mercy of God shown to the heathen,—these are historical traits, which exclude everything like fictitious invention. *Delitzsch*, p. 122, very truly designates the book of Jonah "a confession of sin written down by the corrected prophet under a deep feeling of shame and godly self-denial, as he was moved by the Holy Spirit; which is incorporated with the prophetic writings, for this reason, that Jonah, prophesying there in a manner contrary to his own wishes, was a type of Christ who was to come, in and through whom alone believers, even of the Old Testament age (Jon. iii. 5), have a share in grace." With this, comp. "das Idee des B. Jona" in *Harless*, Zeitschrift f. Protestant, 1851, xxi. 2, p. 102 ff., and *M. Baumgarten*, *ibid.*

(8) "Had the collector of the Canon not believed in the historical truth of this fact, had he beheld only religious truths in the garb of the allegory or fable in this book, why did he not place it among the Hagiographa?" (*Reindl*, p. 2); comp. also *Häv.* pp. 355–6.—But the historical character of the book is raised above all doubts by the utterances of the Lord in Matt. xii. 39 ff., xvi. 4, Luke xi. 29–32, which at the same time throw light upon the prophetico-typical character of the prophet's mission; comp. *Sack*, Christl. Apolog. p. 316 ff., and *Delitzsch*, p. 149 f.

(9) The principal objection of our opponents—as for instance *Hitzig*, p. 157, has brought it into short compass—is that "the whole narrative is miraculous and fabulous; but with God nothing is impossible. Thus Jonah lives in the belly of the fish without being stifled; thus the Kikayon springs up in a night, so high that it overshadows a person sitting.—The lot falls exactly upon the right person;

the storm, which had arisen in conformity with a special purpose, is laid again at the suitable time; and the fish is just at hand to swallow Jonah down, and then to vomit him out again. No less is the tree ready, so as to sprout; and the worm, to kill it; and the fiery wind, to make its loss be felt." He not only denies every miracle,—he also mocks at the guidance of a special providence; and he ignores the known characteristics of the shark (*squalus carcharias*), which is so common in the Mediterranean, and of the Kikayon (the *ricinus*, or tree of wonder), which enable us to conceive of the possibility of the most astonishing wonders in the book: comp. *Bochart*, Hieroz. iii. p. 687 sq.; *Oken*, Naturgesch. iii. 2, p. 169 ff.; *Cuvier*, Thierreich, ii. p. 216; *Rosenmüller*, bibl. Alterthumskunde, iv. 2, p. 466, and iv. 1, p. 123 ff.—Other objections—for instance, that gaps occur in the narrative, that the journey to Nineveh was long and fatiguing, and as to the repentance of the Ninevites, or the like—are refuted by *Häv.* p. 341 ff. [The answers may probably suggest themselves to the reader, even when these objections are urged so moderately and skilfully as they are by *Bleek*, pp. 571–3. (1.) He speaks of the amazing effect produced on so vast a city by such an individual, especially as there is not a trace of such an occurrence, or of consequences springing from it, in the history of Assyria; since Scripture speaks of them as idolaters and despisers of Jehovah, like the other nations, and it contains the prophecies of Isaiah, Nahum, and Zephaniah against Assyria and Nineveh: nor does he think that there is any certain reference to this event in Ezek. iii. 5, 6, to which *Häv.* refers. (2.) He complains of the want of details, such as might have been expected from a writer who was himself the actor or the eye-witness,—such as the name of this remarkable king of Nineveh, the place where Jonah came to land, his subsequent history, and especially his relations afterwards to these converts at Nineveh. (3.) Finally, supposing that Jonah continued alive those three days inside the fish, we can hardly conceive of it as a state of clear consciousness, a state in which the prophet could compose a song; yet this we must do, for it is against the express words to suppose, with many, that he composed it after his deliverance: and what is recorded in ch. ii. would have been utterly unsuitable, as it is a song of thanksgiving instead of a prayer for deliverance.—The position of Jonah, the nature of his message, and the peculiarities in his history, are admirably handled in *Fairbairn*, the substance of his views being stated again in the article "Jonah" in the Imperial Bible Dictionary (London 1866), edited by him. The many mysteries in the case, to which the first and second classes of *Bleek's* objections refer, are to some extent intended, so as to make his life a riddle, and

to force us to look the more attentively to him as a type of Christ—such mystery appearing also in other types, most remarkably in Melchizedek. And while much in his history is of a *symbolic* nature,—for instance, his being made a sort of propitiatory victim, and yet in the end escaping with that life which seemed doomed, in order to return to his work from which he had shrunk; his preaching to the Ninevites (to whom he was a sign, Luke xi. 30, so that his history must in some measure have been made known to them) as one risen from the dead,—nevertheless, in accordance with the universal character of types, there were other things in the symbol which do seem strange, and which would not have been there, were it not for the *prophetic* element involved: but these things become plain when we turn to the antitype. The Vaw of consecution, with which the book begins, does connect it with something going before; yet not with the preceding book of Obadiah, as *Hengstenberg* supposes, but with Jonah's previous prophetic labours, to which we have a reference in 2 Kings xiv. 25. If he had laboured in vain within Israel itself, and felt discouraged at the sight of so much to do at home, and the thought of such ill success in attempting to do it, we may understand his feelings of unwillingness to become a prophet to Nineveh; like those of Moses, who was unwilling to go to Pharaoh, after his experience of the children of Israel refusing to hearken to him. His grief at Nineveh being spared is then to be attributed not to jealousy of his own honour as involved in the prediction of its destruction within forty days; for manifestly it was, in strictness of speech, no prediction, but a threat, if the people did not repent and believe. But Jonah stood upon the verge of a period of judgment on the covenant people, foreseen and announced by all these prophets of the age of Uzziah and Jeroboam, 2 Kings xiii. 23, xiv. 27; and his grief is intelligible enough, whether in the repentance and deliverance of Nineveh he saw the strengthening of those who were to execute the vengeance of Jehovah on his own people, or whether he had hoped to return home and exercise a new influence upon them when he informed them of the terrible divine wrath poured out upon the doomed city. Yet in reality, he ought to have had a more powerful lever for moving the Israelites, when he could provoke them to jealousy and emulation by the narrative of salvation come unto those Gentiles; and Nineveh, the executioner of Jehovah's wrath on His apostate people, became a "harlot," Nah. iii. 4 (which a purely heathen city, perhaps, could not have been), just because she forgot her faith and repentance under the preaching of Jonah,—precisely as the other great executioner of wrath, Babylon, acted under and after the teaching of Daniel.]

(10) The favourite derivation of the history of Jonah at present is from the story of *Hesione*, the Trojan princess, fastened to a rock to be a prey to a sea-monster that desolated the country, but set free by Hercules. One fact, however, is fatal to the explanation—namely, that this myth, like the kindred one of *Perseus* and *Andromeda*, in its older form has no resemblance to the narrative in the Bible, and in its later shape has unmistakeably been remodelled after the heathen came to the knowledge of the history of Jonah. Comp. *Häv.* p. 335 ff. Even *Winer* (bibl. Real-Wörterbuch, i. p. 597) finds it "very improbable that occasion should have been found by a Hebrew writer to work up the materials of a Philistine myth in an Israelite form." [*Bleek*, pp. 575–6, is also decided, on similar grounds, in rejecting every such derivation, though approved by *Gesenius*, *De Wette*, *Rosenmüller*, *Friedrichsen*, etc.]

§ 90. *Author and Date of the Book.*

If the mission of the prophet to Nineveh, as recorded in the book, rests on a firm foundation as a historical fact (§ 89), then there can be no well-founded doubt of its being composed by the prophet himself. And this would take place not long after the events and the return of Jonah to his mother country (1), since neither the subject-matter of the book nor its language demands a later age (2).

(1) The date of his mission to Nineveh cannot be exactly determined. *Crusius*, *l.c.*, *Delitzsch*, and *Häv.* conjecture that it was the time "in which, after Jeroboam II.'s son Zechariah and Shallum had been spoiled of their short-lived royal honours, in consequence of the curse which went forth upon Jehu, the new ruler Menahem (B.C. 771) called in Pul the king of Assyria, who was bent on making conquests, and purchased at a high price from him the confirmation of his government, 2 Kings xv. 19."

(2) See the collection of the reasons for a later composition of the book, in *Friedrichsen*, p. 179 ff.—The narrative in the *third* person does not militate against the composition by Jonah, but belongs to the objective character of the historical representation, as in Isa. vii. 3 ff., xx. 2, etc. It is a mere assumption to speak of the mythical character of the subject-matter. The statement, iii. 3, וְנִינְוֵה הָיְתָה עִיר גְּדוֹלָה, furnishes no proof that Nineveh had then been destroyed: for the verb is "the synchronistic imperfect, precisely like Gen. i. 2; Nineveh *was* a great city at the time Jonah came to it; that is, he found it such" (*Stäudlin*, N. Beitrr. p. 228; *Delitzsch*, p. 121; and even *De Wette*,

Einl. § 237).—Also the circumstance that the prayer, ch. ii. 3–10, contains so many reminiscences of the Psalms, so that already *Burk* named it "præstantissimum exemplum psalterii recte applicati," does not lead us to think the book a late production: for the Psalms of which there are echoes here (comp. ver. 3 with Ps. xviii. 7 [perhaps cxx. 1]; ver. 4 with Ps. xlii. 8; ver. 5 with Ps. xxxi. 23; ver. 6 with Ps. xviii. 5 and lxix. 2; ver. 8 with Ps. cxlii. 4, xviii. 7, and v. 8; [ver. 9 with Ps. xxxi. 7;] ver. 10 with Ps. xxvi. 7, xlii. 5, [iii. 9,] and l. 14, 23) proceed either from David, or at any rate from the age of David.—The language of the book certainly contains Aramaisms—הֵטִיל, "to cast forth," i. 5, 12, 15, and used of a storm, i. 4; סְפִינָה, "a ship," interchanged with אֳנִיָּה, i. 5; מָנָה, "to prepare," ii. 1, iv. 6, 8; טַעַם, "decree," iii. 7; and other expressions used peculiarly—הִתְעַשֵּׁת, "to think," or "to show oneself gracious, serene," i. 6; חָתַר, "to row," i. 13; בְּשִׁלְמִי, i. 7; בְּשִׁלִּי, i. 12; and ·שְׁ, iv. 10, as in Canticles. Yet none of these words can with certainty be said not to belong to the old Hebrew modes of expression. Even טַעַם may have become known to the Israelites from the time of Menahem as the technical expression for the edicts of the Assyrian monarchs. Comp. *Delitzsch*, p. 116 f. [and *Pusey*, Introd. to Jonah].—The trifling value of these arguments as proof of later composition is shown by the great difference among critics on this point. For instance, *Goldhorn* thinks it belongs to the age of the Assyrian captivity; *Rosenmüller* and *Bertholdt*, to the age of Josiah; *Jäger*, to that of the Babylonian captivity; *Jahn*, *Knobel*, *Köster* (Proph. p. 118), *Ewald*, *E. Meier*, to the age which followed; *Krahmer*, after the year B.C. 515; *Vatke* (bibl. Theol. i. p. 580) places it in the third century; *Hitzig* (des Proph. Jona Orakel über Moab, p. 36 ff., and kleine Proph. p. 162), in the Maccabean age, holding that it was written in Egypt, "that land of wonders," on account of the Egyptian Kikayon, iv. 6. [*Bleek*, p. 576, rejects this notion of *Hitzig's* as utterly erroneous. But his own opinion is undecided,—only he thinks the book must have been composed a considerable time after Jonah's own age, on account of "the poetical manner" in which his history is treated—nay, after the fall of Nineveh, by a grammatical inference from ch. iii. 3, to which attention has been already turned; and he does not positively oppose the view of *Jäger*, that it was written in the commencement of the Persian age, and that when the author spoke of Nineveh he was really thinking of Babylon. Yet he would not think, with *Jäger*, of the book being written in Babylonia, but rather in Judea.]

VI. MICAH (מִיכָה).

Commentaries:—*Dav. Chytræi*, Explicatio Michæ et Nahum, Vitebergæ 1565, 8vo (also in *Chytræi*, Opp. ii. p. 2183). Animadverss. philol. crit. ad vaticinia Michæ, ex collatione versionum Græc. reliquarumque in Polygl. Lond. editarum, præs. *Chr. Fr. Schnurrer*, auct. Tubingæ 1783, 4to. *G. L. Bauer*, Animadverss. crit. in duo priora proph. Michæ capp., Altdorf. 1790, 4to. Translations and expositions, by *A. H. Grosschopf*, Jena 1798; *K. W. Justi*, Leipzig 1799; *A. Th. Hartmann*, Lemgo 1800. *C. P. Caspari*, über Micha den Morasthiten, u. seine prophet. Schrift. Ein monograph. Beitr. zur Geschichte des alttestamentlichen Schriftthums u. zur Auslegung des B. Micha, Christiana 1852.

§ 91. *The Person of the Prophet.*

Micah of Moresheth, in the neighbourhood of Gath (1), prophesied under the kings Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah, and thus at the same time as Isaiah, probably in Jerusalem, against all Israel; yet especially against Judah (i. 1; comp. Isa. i. 1) (2). This statement in the superscription is in harmony with the subject-matter of his prophecies, in which the fall of Samaria is announced as coming and close at hand, and Assyria is mentioned as the most dangerous enemy of the theocracy (i. 5–7, vi. 16, v. 4, 5, vii. 12). It is in harmony, too, with the relation of his prophecies to those of Isaiah (3), and with the notice in Jer. xxvi. 18. The genuineness of the superscription, therefore, cannot be assailed (4).

(1) See *Caspari*, p. 1 ff., as to the form and meaning of the prophet's name. The epithet "the Morasthite," by which he is distinguished from an older prophet of the same name under Ahab (1 Kings xxii. 8 ff.) [Micah being a common shortening of Micaiah, and the two forms being used interchangeably in the same narrative. *Bleek*, p. 539, observes that the two men were confounded by some of the Fathers; and he adds the extraordinary assertion, that the same mistake appears to have been made by the author of the books of Kings, writing during the captivity: his reason for this assertion being that the closing words of the elder prophet are the same as the opening words of the younger; as to which, however, see § 92, Note 3], is not a patronymic, but is to be understood as derived from his

place of birth. *Jerome*, prol. in Comm. in Mich.: "*de Morasthi*, qui usque hodie juxta Eleutheropolim urbem Palæstinæ haud grandis est viculus." But the derivation from *Mareshah*, i. 15, Josh. xv. 44, is decidedly incorrect [*Bleek*, p. 538, quite coincides with *Keil* in this opinion], since Micah himself distinguishes the two names; comp. *Caspari*, p. 32 ff.—See, in *Carpzov*, p. 374 sq., later traditions as to his death and place of burial, which are quite uncertain.

(2) The traces of his extraction from a little country place, which *Ewald*, i. p. 324, and *Meier*, in *Zeller's* Jahrb. i. p. 508, wish to find in his prophecies, are uncertain. Comp. *Häv.* p. 365, and *Caspari*, p. 53 ff. We are unmistakeably directed by i. 9 to Jerusalem as the scene of his labours.

(3) This relation is not confined to Isaiah's making an utterance of Micah (iv. 1–3) the theme of his prophecy, ch. ii. (§ 66, Note 6); but it shows itself in manifold agreement of their thoughts (for instance, comp. i. 3 with Isa. xxvi. 21), especially in reference to Messianic prophecies: comp. v. 1 ff. with Isa. vii. 14; vii. 12 with Isa. xi. 11 ff.; vii. 17 with Isa. xlix. 23. "Quo certior esset doctrinæ fides, voluit Deus Jesaiam et Micham loqui simul, quasi uno ore et talem consensum profiteri, quo possent convinci omnes rebelles" (*Carpzov*, p. 375). Comp. *Häv.* p. 364, and *Caspari*, Beitrr. z. Einl. in d. B. Jes. pp. 97–8.

(4) Its genuineness has been doubted by *Hartmann*, Mich. p. 7 ff., and *Bertholdt*, pp. 1634–5, whose objections consist of wholly untenable assumptions. It has also been doubted by *De Wette*, § 238, *Hitzig*, p. 177, and *Ewald*, i. p. 327, chiefly on account of the notice in Jer. xxvi. 18, that in the reign of Hezekiah Micah prophesied the destruction of Jerusalem. But the elders of the people (in that passage of Jeremiah) name the age of Hezekiah, not because the time when that particular discourse, Mic. iii., was delivered was still known, "owing to good historical recollection" (*Ewald*); nor yet because they themselves had been alive at that time (*Häv.* p. 363), for then they must have been over a hundred years old; but because Hezekiah was the only theocratic authority among the three kings named in the superscription—the one who had paid regard to the prophet's voice; and because Micah had first brought together his individual utterances into his book under this king (*Hengstb.* Christol. i. p. 480). A person composing the superscription at a later time would certainly have mentioned only Hezekiah: the parallels Mic. iv. 1–3 and Isa. ii. 2–4 could not have furnished him with any sufficient reason for going beyond Hezekiah, and naming also Jotham and Ahaz. The other reasons are still more futile. One cannot see why Micah him-

self could not name Samaria in the superscription, when he foretold its ruin in i. 6, 7. And the shorter form of his name, מִיכָה, proves nothing; since already in Judg. xvii. 1, 4, 5, 8, this form alternates with the longer מִיכָיְהוּ. Comp. *Caspari*, Mich. p. 60 ff.

The prophetic discourse of Micah is like Isaiah's in the boldness and loftiness of the thought; in the rounding off, the clearness, and the liveliness of the representation; in the wealth of imagery and comparisons (i. 8, 16, ii. 12, 13, iv. 9, 10, etc.), and other rhetorical figures, such as individualizing, dialogue (vi. 1–8, vii. 7–20), paronomasia, and play upon words (specially accumulated at i. 10–15). Yet he is distinguished from him by quick and sudden changes from threatening to promise, and the reverse (ii. 12, 13, iv. 9–14, vii. 11 ff.), which remind us of Hosea. The diction soars poetically, and is rhythmically rounded off; and the language is classically pure.

§ 92. *The Book of Micah.*

In the book of Micah we do not have the individual discourses which the prophet uttered at different times (1), but their essential contents united in a collected form (2), and divided into three sections, mutually connected, and referring to one another (ch. i. and ii., iii.–v., vi. and vii.). In the form of prophetical discourses they threaten judgments on the theocracy,—namely, the destruction of Samaria and Jerusalem, together with the temple, and the carrying of the people away captive, on account of the prevalent sins of idolatry, and the covetousness of the powerful classes, the injustice of the judges, and the lying spirit of the false prophets; but they also announce, as coming after the judgment, redemption from the misery, gathering of the delivered remnant of Israel, and glorification of Zion by the Messiah (3). It follows from the internal unity of the book, that the prophet composed it in the reign of Hezekiah. On account of the frequent rebukes of idolatry (i. 5, v. 11–13, vi. 16), it appears to have been composed before the extermination of idolatry throughout the land, which followed the solemn celebration of the passover (2 Chron. xxx. xxxi.), and before the overthrow of the kingdom of the Ten Tribes, on account of the announcement of the destruction of Samaria (i. 6, 7). It is therefore to be dated in the period B.C. 728–722 (4).

(1) A view which *Maurer* and *Hitzig* still adopt; placing ch. i. and ii. before the fall of Samaria, ch. iii.–v. after it, and ch. vi. and vii. still later.

(2) This was rightly understood already among the older writers, by *Lightfoot* and *Majus;* it has been established anew by *Hengstb.* Christol. i. p. 474 ff., and *Häv.* p. 366 ff.; and it is acknowledged by *Knobel*, *De Wette*, *Ewald*, *Meier*, and others.

(3) Each of these discourses begins with שִׁמְעוּ, i. 2, iii. 1, vi. 1. By its introductory words, שִׁמְעוּ עַמִּים כֻּלָּם, the first is linked on to the discourse of his more ancient namesake under Aḥab (1 Kings xxii. 28); and by being so linked, it is declared that the labours of the younger Micah are a continuation of his predecessor's, who had to struggle against the class of false prophets [in *Israel;* for our prophet is the first who mentions them in *Judah*] (*Hengstb.* pp. 475–6). The second discourse is closely connected with the first by וְאָמַר, iii. 1. Besides, these discourses are proved to be connected sections of one whole, by the manifest progress in the prophetic announcements; not only in reference to the Messianic salvation, but also in reference to the threatenings of punishment. In the *first* Judah is threatened, that the deadly strokes which fall upon Samaria will reach to the very gate of Jerusalem (i. 9, 12); in the *second* it is announced in the strongest language that Jerusalem and the temple are to be destroyed, and the people to be carried away to Babylon (iii. 12, iv. 10). In the *first* there is a promise of the redemption of the covenant people from their misery, and of their victorious exodus from their bondage (ii. 12, 13); in the *second* the positive salvation is delineated, the glorification of the theocracy, by the appearing and majesty of the Messiah (iv. and v.). The *third* discourse has the character of impressive exhortation, as well in the threatening as in the promise.—This organic articulation of the book, which *Caspari*, Micha, p. 100 ff., has proved at great length, is misunderstood not only by *Eichhorn* and others, who tear ch. i. and ii. asunder, but also by *Ewald*, p. 326, and *Meier*, p. 505, who combine ch. i.–iii., and wish to strike out of the text the promise ii. 12, 13, as if it were a gloss. Against them comp. *Hofmann*, Weissagung u. Erfüllung, i. p. 212.

(4) Comp. *Caspari*, Beitr. zu Jes. pp. 60–1, and Micha, p. 100.

VII. NAHUM (נַחוּם).

Commentaries:—*J. H. Ursini*, Hypomnemata in Obad. et Nahum, Francofurti 1652. *Matt. Haffenrefferi*, Comm. in Nahum et Habacuc, Stutgardiæ 1663, 4to. Vaticinia Chabacuci et Nahumi,

itemque nonnulla Jesaiæ, Mich., et Ezech. oracula observatt. hist. crit. illustr., etc., auct. *J. Gottl. Kalinsky*, Vratislaviæ 1748, 4to. Vat. Nahumi observatt. phil. illustratum; Diss. præs. *M. C. M. Agrell*, resp. *N. S. Colliander*, Upsalæ 1788, 4to. Vaticc. Nahumi et Habac. Interpr. et notas adjecit *E. J. Greve*, edit. metrica, Amstelodami 1793, 4to. *Chr. M. Fraehn*, curarum exeg. crit. in Nah. Proph. spec., Rostochii 1806, 4to. Nahumi vatic. philologice et crit. expositum, sive spec. Acad., quod præs. *J. H. Pareau*, publicæ disceptationi committit *Ever. Kreenen*, Hardev. 1808, 4to. Translations with expositions, by *S. F. Günth. Wahl*, in his Mag. 1790; *H. A. Grimm*, 1790; *Mos. Neumann*, Breslau 1808; *H. Mitteldorpff*, Hamburg 1808; *Justi*, Leipzig 1820, and in his Blumen althebr. Dichtk. ii. p. 577. *A. G. Hoelemann*, Nahumi orac. versibus german. ὁμοιοτελευτοις et scholiis illustr., Lipsiæ 1842. *O. Strauss*, Nahumi de Nino vatic. expl. ex Assyr. monumm. illustr., Berolini 1853.

§ 93. *The Person of the Prophet.*

Of *Nahum* we know nothing but that his native place was Elkosh, a village in Galilee (1); and, as we learn from the contents of his book, that after the overthrow of the kingdom of the Ten Tribes, in Judah (2) he prophesied the destruction of Nineveh, and the overthrow of the Assyrian worldly power (i. 14, ii. 1, 2, 6 ff., iii. 1 ff.).

(1) הָאֶלְקֹשִׁי, i. 1. *Jerome*, præf. in comm. in Nah.: "Quidam putant, *Helkeseum* patrem esse Nahum, et secundum Hebræam traditionem etiam ipsum prophetam fuisse; quum Helkesei usque hodie in Galilæa viculus sit, parvus quidem et vix ruinis veterum ædificiorum indicans vestigia, sed tamen notus Judæis et mihi quoque a circumducente monstratus." Comp. with this the less exact statements of *Cyril* of Alexandria, ad Nah. i. 1, and of the *Pseudo-Epiphanius*, de vita prophet. c. xvii., in *Carpzov*, p. 385, and in *Knobel*, Prophetismus, ii. p. 209 f. A trace of this name has been preserved in the sect of the Elkesaites; comp. *Delitzsch*, in *Rudelbach* u. *Guericke's* Zeitschrift, 1843, i. p. 43; and comp. *Häv.* p. 377, on the interpretation of אֶלְקֹשִׁי by מבית קושי in the Chaldee.—Historical traces are wanting for *Knobel's* (p. 210) combination of the Galilean extraction of Nahum with the place of Capernaum (Nahum's village). Also the opinion that Nahum's birth-place was the Assyrian Elkosh (*Assemani*, Biblioth. orient. i. 525, iii. 1, 352; *Niebuhr*, Reise, ii. p. 352), adopted by *Michaelis*, *Eichhorn*, *Grimm*, and *Ewald*, i. p. 350, rests upon quite modern testimony of the sixteenth century, and finds

no support either in the contents or in the language of our book. "It is also quite conceivable how, amid the ignorance of later posterity as to the man's dwelling-place, it was conjectured to be in the neighbourhood of Nineveh, against which he had prophesied. A grave of Jonah, too, is shown beside Nineveh; and in consequence of a village standing near the grave of Nahum, that village received the name of Elkosh" (*Hitzig, ibid.* Comp. also *Häv.* p. 376; and *O. Strauss*, p. iv. sqq.). [*Bleek*, p. 542, is quite of the opinion of *Keil* and *Hitzig*; and he observes also, that *Layard* thinks the grave by no means very old, and certainly of Christian origin. In the same page he remarks that the name *Nahum* is not found elsewhere in the Old Testament, though it does occur in inscriptions, both in Hebrew and in Greek letters, as a Phœnician name.]

(2) Passages like ii. 1–3 point to Judah as the place where he prophesied [*Bleek*, p. 544, draws the same conclusion from i. 12, 13, in opposition to *Ewald*, who thinks that he composed his book in the neighbourhood of Nineveh], while the delineations in ii. 4, 5, iii. 2, 3, do not discover the prophet to be an eye-witness, but only show his lively imagination; and ii. 7 is evidence of no more exact local knowledge of Nineveh than any one in Hither Asia had of that renowned city.

His prophecy bears testimony to his rich and lively imagination; in spite of individual cases of accord with older prophecies (3), the representation is original, clear, and rhythmically rounded; the language is classical, and free from later Chaldaisms (4).

(3) Besides individual passages in the Pentateuch (comp. i. 3 with Ex. xx. 5, xxxiv. 6, Num. xiv. 17, 18) and the Psalms (for instance, i. 7 with Ps. xxxvii. 39), in particular there are found cases of accord of Isaiah: i. 4 with Isa. l. 2, xxxiii. 9; ii. 1 with Isa. lii. 1, 7; ii. 11 with Isa. xxii. 5, xxiv. 1, xxi. 3, and Joel ii. 6; iii. 4, 5, with Isa. xlvii. 9 [3]; iii. 4 with Isa. li. 19; and there are others.

(4) The proofs of later *usus loquendi* adduced by *Hitzig*, p. 228, prove nothing, because they are chiefly taken from parallels with Isaiah. מָכַר, iii. 4, is not "to ensnare," according to the Arabic usage, but "to sell," like Joel iv. 3; comp. *Maurer* on the passage. The Aramaisms, נָהַג, "to groan" [English version erroneously, "to lead"], ii. 8, דִּיהֹר [iii. 2], like [the noun] Judg. v. 23, and perhaps פְּלֵרוֹת, ii. 4, are sufficiently explained by the prophet's Galilean origin; and טַפְסַר, iii. 17, probably not Shemitic, by the Assyrian invasions. On the contrary, the Assyrian origin of מִפְגָּר, iii. 17, is very doubtful; and

the explanation of הֻצַּב, ii. 8, as the proper name of the Assyrian queen (*Ewald*, p. 350; *E. Meier*, hebr. Wurzelwörterb. p. 319), is decidedly untrue.

§ 94. *The Book of Nahum.*

The "utterance" (מַשָּׂא) [perhaps better, as the older authorities translated it, "burden"] concerning Nineveh contained in "the book of the vision of Nahum," i. 1 (1), forms a connected prophecy (2), with three turns in it corresponding to the three chapters. To the metropolis of the Assyrian monarchy the announcement of judgment is made, utter ruin on account of its sins (iii. 1, 4), at a time when Assyria ruled in full strength over the nations (i. 12, ii. 12 ff., iii. 1, 2), and had not only annihilated the kingdom of Israel (ii. 3), but had also deeply humiliated Judah (i. 9, 11, 12) (3). It follows from this that the date of the composition of the book was the second half of Hezekiah's reign, or the time immediately after the discomfiture of Sennacherib before Jerusalem (2 Kings xix. 35, 36) (4); which agrees well with the absence of any more precise designation of the executioner of this judgment, since nothing certain in reference to the date is furnished by the allusion to the destruction of Thebes in iii. 8 (5).

(1) *Bertholdt*, p. 1659, and *Ewald*, pp. 61 and 353, and *De Wette* have doubted, on insufficient grounds, whether the first part of the superscription, מַשָּׂא נִינְוֵה, originally stood there. מַשָּׂא designates the contents of the prophecy, as חָזוֹן designates its form; and if the words which have been called in question were absent, the statement of the object of the threatening would be awanting in ch. i. and ii., and they would be unintelligible. Comp. *Häv.* p. 370.

(2) It has been wrongly taken separate by *Huetius*, demonstr. evangel. iv. p. 441; by *Kalinsky*, pp. 230 sq. and 269 sq.; and by *Bertholdt*, p. 1661. Against this, see *Eichhorn*, iv. p. 392 ff., and all the more recent critics.

(3) "In its essence, the tendency of the call of Nahum was, that he might be a witness of the divine righteousness (i. 2, 3), in which sense he was to interpret the mighty deeds of God in the times immediately preceding; and then to prophesy the future of judgment, and in connection with this to proclaim a strongly consolatory message to the sorely humbled covenant people" (*Häv.* p. 378).

(4) So already *Vitringa*, Typ. doctr. proph. p. 37: "Figenda est Nahumi ætas proxime post Jesajam et Micham, atque adeo sub Hiskia, non tantum post deportationem decem tribuum, sed et post cladem Sennacheribi, c. i. 11, 13, unde argumentum prophetiæ desumtum est et captata occasio prædicandi integrum Nini et Assyriaci regni interitum." Many touches in the prophecy point to the invasion of Sennacherib as an event still fresh in the recollection of men: comp. i. 9, 11, 12, with Isa. xxxvi. 14 ff., 18 ff., xxxvii. 3, 17; ii. 14 with Isa. xxxvi. 13 ff., xxxvii. 9; and *Häv.* pp. 372–3. Yet in i. 14 there does not lie any allusion to the murder of Sennacherib, Isa. xxxvii. 38.—*Jerome*, *Calov.*, *Maius* (œc. Vet. Test. p. 836), *Jäger*, de ord. proph. min. ii. p. 4, erroneously place the prophecy within the period of Sennacherib's invasion. Others, like the *Seder Olam*, pp. 55, 105, ed. *Meyer*, *Jarchi*, *Abarbanel*, *Grotius*, *Grimm*, *Strauss*, *Hengstb.* Christol. iii. 2, p. 189, place it in the time of Manasseh; *Josephus*, Antiq. ix. 11, 3, under Jotham; and finally, *Ewald*, pp. 350–1, *Hitzig*, p. 225, and *Meier* in *Zeller's* Jahrbücher, i. p. 511, in the time of the later Median struggles with Assyria, either in the time of *Phraortes* (Herod. i. 102), or in that of *Cyaxares* and his first siege of Nineveh (Herod. i. 103). Against this, comp. *Häv.* pp. 374–5, and *Hengstb. ibid.* [*Bleek*, p. 543, takes the view of *Keil*, thinking it certain that the same prince is meant in i. 11 and ver. 14, and agreeing with the common opinion that this prince is Sennacherib.]

(5) Comp. *Winer*, bibl. Real-Wörterbuch, ii. pp. 160–1. [*Bleek*, p. 543, thinks this may not improbably be connected with Isa. xx., and that the Assyrians may have achieved this success against Egypt and Thebes somewhat before the fourteenth year of Hezekiah, the event being therefore quite recent when Nahum wrote.]

VIII. HABAKKUK (חֲבַקּוּק).

Commentaries:—*Dav. Chytræi*, Lectiones in proph. Hab., in his works, tom. ii. *Ant. Agellii*, Comm. in proph. Hab., Antverpiæ 1597. *Helv. Garthii*, Comm. in proph. Hab., Vitebergæ 1605. *Kalinsky*; see § 93. Chabacuci vatic., comm. crit. atque exeg. illustr. auct. *B. P. Kofod*, Hafniæ 1792. *H. C. A. Hähnlein*, Symbolæ crit. ad interpret. vaticc. Hab., Erlangæ 1795, 8vo. *G. A. Ruperti*, explicatio cap. i. et ii. Chab., in the Commentatt. theol., ed. *Velthusen*, *Kuinœl*, et *Ruperti*, iii. p. 405 sqq. *Guil. A. Schröder*, Dissert. in Cant. Chab., Groningæ 1781, 4to. *Ch. F. Schnurrer*, diss. philol. ad carm. Chab. c. iii., Tubingæ 1786, 4to, in his Dissertatt. phil. crit.

p. 342 sqq. Hymnus Hab. vers. ac notis phil. et crit. illustr. auct. *Mœrner*, Upsalæ 1791, 4to. Der Prophet Habakuk ausgelegt v. *Fr. Delitzsch*, Leipzig 1843. Translations and expositions, by *B. Ludwig*, Frankfurt 1779; *S. F. G. Wahl* (with introd. and discussions), Hannover 1790; *G. C. Horst*, Gotha 1798; *Justi*, Leipzig 1821; *Abr. Al. Wolff*, Darmstadt 1822.

For Introduction:—*A. F. Ranitz*, introd. in Hab. vaticinia, Lipsiæ 1808. *J. G. Stickel*, prolusio ad interpret. tertii cap. Hab., Part i., Neostadii 1827. *G. F. L. Baeumlein*, Commentat. de Hab. vatic., Heilbronnæ 1840. *Fr. Delitzsch*, de Hab. proph. vita et ætate dissert., Lipsiæ 1842. *H. A. Hamaker*, commentariorum in Hab. vaticc. prolegg., in the Orientalia edd. *Juynboll, Roorda, Weijers*, ii. p. i. sqq.

§ 95. *Person and Age of the Prophet.*

No historical information exists as to the person of *Habakkuk* (1), but only apocryphal legends (2). Yet from the subscription, iii. 19, it may be concluded that he was of the tribe of Levi (3).—According to what we find in his book, he prophesied earlier than the Chaldean invasion of Palestine, yet according to i. 5 scarcely a generation before it (4); also, according to ii. 20, comp. with Zeph. i. 7, shortly before Zephaniah; and according to i. 8, comp. with Jer. iv. 13 and v. 6, before Jeremiah came forward as a prophet—that is, before the thirteenth year of Josiah (5). This would place him somewhere in the period B.C. 650–627 (6).

(1) As to the form and meaning of the name, see *Delitzsch*, diss. p. 3 sq., and Comm. pp. 1, 2. [*Bleek*, p. 544, says this proper name does not occur elsewhere in the Old Testament, and that the form in the Septuagint, *Ἀμβακούμ*, has derived its first *m* from a pronunciation with *Daghesh* in the ב, but that the final *m* is unexampled; nor can we determine whether it was so written by the translators themselves.]

(2) These legends are discussed by *Delitzsch*, diss., and by *Hamaker*, *l.c.*

(3) From this subscription, "To the chief on *my* stringed instruments," *Delitzsch*, Comm. pp. iii. and 204–5, infers rightly that Habakkuk filled a situation which authorized him to take part officially in the liturgical music of the temple; then he must have been either a priest or a Levite. He also lays stress upon this circumstance: on the one hand, "the individuality stamped upon his prophecy, more

than on any of the rest, of the nature of the Psalms, and the affinity between its contents and the Psalms generally, those of David and of Asaph in particular;" and, on the other hand, the heading borne by the apocryphal story of Bel and the Dragon, in the translation of the Septuagint (Codex Chisi), and in the Syrian-hexaplar version, which was made from it, Ἐκ προφητείας Ἀμβακοὺμ υἱοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐκ τῆς φυλῆς Λευΐ. There are other statements in the *Pseudo-Epiphanius*, c. xviii., οὗτος ἦν ἐξ ἀγροῦ Βηθζοκὴρ (or Βεδζεχὰρ) ἐκ φυλῆς Συμεών; *Dorotheus Tyrius*, Ἐξ ἀγροῦ Βῆθι τοῦ χάρ (that is, the Talmudical בֵּפַר דִּכְרִין, a small town to the north of Lydda): comp. *Delitzsch*, Hab. p. iii. [*Bleek*, p. 545, refers to the statements of the Fathers and the Rabbins, as given by *Delitzsch*, and by *De Wette*, § 242, Anm. *a*; and he pronounces them little consistent with one another, and in themselves of no more value than the apocryphal story that Habakkuk was brought by the angel of the Lord from Judea to feed Daniel in the lion's den.]

(4) Habakkuk prophesies of the appearing of the Chaldeans, and their invasion of Judea, as of something incredible; but at the same time as ensuing "in your days," that is, in the time of the generation then alive. Consequently he must have uttered his prophecy before they appeared in Hither Asia, before the battle of Carchemish, in the fourth year of Jehoiakim (Jer. xlvi. 2). From this expression, "in your days," *Delitzsch*, Hab. p. vii., infers that we ought not to pass beyond the reign of Josiah, or venture to place the *terminus a quo* of the prophecy more than twenty years before the first invasion of Nebuchadnezzar at the utmost. But we cannot make a determinate measurement of "in your days" from the passages Jer. xvi. 9, Ezek. xii. 25. The expression is very much a relative one, and must not be pressed by any means too strongly in rhetorical language.

(5) *Kueper*, Jer. p. 75 sqq.; *Caspari*, in *Rudelbach* u. *Guericke's* Zeitschrift, 1843, ii. pp. 71–2; *Delitzsch*, Hab. p. vii. ff.; and *Häv.* pp. 386–7, have established beyond all contradiction, that use has been made of the prophecy of Habakkuk by Zephaniah, *l.c.*, and by Jeremiah in discourses of the time of Josiah. Yet this dependence on him does not unconditionally exclude the idea of their being contemporary with him in their work: hence it remains a possibility that Habakkuk also did not prophesy till Josiah's time, and in fact not before the twelfth year of his reign,—the year in which idolatry began to be overturned, and the worship of Jehovah to be restored; since the restoration of the ancient worship and of the liturgical service of song is taken for granted in ch. iii., the words of which were appointed to be used in the public worship of God, accompanied by music, as is

seen from ver. 19 (*Delitzsch*, Hab. p. x.). And yet this argument does not elevate the possibility into certainty. For Manasseh also, on his return from Babylon, put away the idols out of the temple, restored the altar of Jehovah, and offered on it peace-offerings and thank-offerings, and commanded Israel to serve Jehovah, God of Israel (2 Chron. xxxiii. 15, 16): so that Habakkuk might have composed his psalm on that occasion also; and he may have belonged to those prophets who in Manasseh's reign prophesied of calamity to Jerusalem and Judah, so that the ears of every one who heard it should tingle (2 Kings xxi. 12; 2 Chron. xxxiii. 18; comp. with Hab. i. 5, 6). [This might also give emphasis to his prediction that Judea should be invaded and ruined by the *Chaldeans*, with whom Manasseh and his people had been brought in contact during his captivity at Babylon, but only as a conquered people like themselves, under the power of the same great Assyrian monarch. Compare also the friendly feeling of the Chaldeans towards Judah in the reign of Manasseh's father; and the threatenings Mic. iv. 10, Isa. xxxix., which Habakkuk might take up at a time when the people little thought of its becoming a reality, in *their* days at least, or which they might flatter themselves had been exhausted in Manasseh's captivity.]

(6) *Vitringa*, typ. doctr. proph. p. 38, had already pronounced in favour of the time of Josiah: as the Rabbins in the Seder Olam, p. 55, had for the time of Manasseh, which is the opinion also of *Witsius*, Miscell. ss. i. p. 237; of *Buddæus*, hist. eccl. Vet. Test. ii. p. 485; of *Carpzov*, p. 398 sq.; of *Wahl*, Hab. p. 16 f.; of *Kofod*, *l.c.* p. 4; of *Jahn*, Einl. ii. p. 513; and of *Häv.* p. 386 ff. The date of the prophecy is brought down much lower by most of the recent critics: by *Stickel*, *l.c.* p. 47; by *Jaeger*, de ord. proph. min. ii. p. 18 sq.; by *Knobel*, *Maurer*, *Ewald*, *Bäumlein*, *De Wette*, *Hamaker*, *l.c.*, and *Umbreit*, to the time of Jehoiakim, when every one could already foresee the invasion by the Chaldees [this is also the view of *Bleek*, p. 546, who thinks it inadmissible to suppose that the prophet belonged to the Assyrian period, and he pronounces the opinion which is next mentioned "decidedly false"]; by *Eichhorn*, *Bertholdt*, *Justi*, *Wolf*, and others, actually to the time during which the Chaldeans desolated Judea, which would make Habakkuk's book merely a *vaticinium ex eventu*. See the refutation of these opinions in *Häv.* pp. 383–4, and *Delitzsch*, Hab. pp. iv. v.

His representations are not inferior to those of the most flourishing age of prophecy, in independent strength, in perfect beauty of arrangement of the parts, and in skilfully rounded discourse; and

they combine the greatest force and fulness with the loftiest flights of thought (7). The style is distinguished by carefully selected and unusual words and turns of expression, which are in some measure quite peculiar to himself.

(7) *Delitzsch*, Hab. p. xiii.: "Nowhere else do we find the form of *alternate discourse* (between God and the prophet) carried out so far, or *prophecy* so intimately connected with *lyric poetry* (to the extent which we see in the structure of the strophes in ch. ii., and the musical arrangement in ch. iii.). Like Isaiah, he is comparatively far less dependent than other prophets on his predecessors, in respect of both form and matter. Everything still mirrors the most flourishing age of the prophetic order,—that age in which prophetic poetry took the place of the holy lyric poetry that had hitherto been the mode of utterance for the religious life of the church, and having been laid hold of mightily by God, came with her trumpet voice to awaken anew the consciousness of God in the church now spiritually dead." [*Bleek*, pp. 545–6, gives a criticism on the style very similar to this of *Keil's*.]

§ 96. *The Book of Habakkuk.*

The prophecy of Habakkuk is clothed in a dramatic form,—man questioning and complaining, God answering with threatening. It announces as nearest of all, the impending fearful judgment by the instrumentality of the Chaldeans on the theocracy because of its prevailing moral corruption (ch. i.); and next to this, in a fivefold woe, the downfall of this arrogant, violent, God-forgetting, and idolatrous offender (ch. ii.); and it concludes with the answer of the believing Church to this twofold divine revelation,—that is to say, with a prophetico-lyric echo of the impressions and feelings produced in the prophet's mind (1) by these two divine revelations when pondered in the light of the Lord's great doings in times past [ch. iii.] (2).

(1) Comp. the admirable development of the contents of this prophecy, and of its organic articulation as it forms an indivisible whole, in *Delitzsch*, Comm. There is now no more need for refuting the contrary opinions (proceeding from utter want of understanding) of *Kalinsky*, p. 145 sq.; of *Friedrich*, in *Eichhorn*, allg. Biblioth. x. p. 420 ff.; of *Horst*, Visionen Hab. pp. 31–2; of *Rosenmüller*, of *Maurer*, and others, that the book contains various discourses of

various dates. The same may be said of the assertion of *Hamaker*, p. 16 sq., that the first discourse is only a fragment.

(2) Hence it leans in manifold ways on the older songs and psalms, and reproduces their thoughts (Deut. xxxiii. 2; Judg. v. 4, 5; Ps. lxviii. 8, 9), but especially on Ps. lxxvii. 16–21; comp. *Delitzsch*, Hab. p. 118 ff.

There is no room for doubting that this book was composed by the prophet himself.

IX. ZEPHANIAH (צְפַנְיָה).

Commentaries:—*Mart. Buceri*, Sophonias ad veritatem Ebr. vers. et comm. explic., Argentorati 1528. *Jo. Andr. Noltenii*, Dissert. exeg. prælim. in proph. Zeph., Trajecti ad Viadrum 1719, 4to. *C. Fr. Cramer*, Scyth. Denkmäler in Paläst., 1777. *Dan. a Coelln*, Specileg. observationum exeg. crit. ad Zephanjae vatic., Vratislaviæ 1818, 4to. *S. A. Herwig*, Beitr. z. d. Erläut. des Proph. Zephanja, in *Bengel's* Arch. i. 3. *Fr. Adolph. Strauss*, vaticc. Zephanjæ comm. illustr., Berolini 1843. Translation, with notes, by *P. Ewald*, Erlangen 1827.

§ 97. *The Person of the Prophet.*

Zephaniah [whose name is written by the Septuagint Σοφονίας, and so also in the Vulgate, the pronunciation being taken from the participle; *Bleek*, p. 547], the great-great-grandson of Hezekiah (1), prophesied under Josiah (i. 1). And it seems plain, from the notice of the existing public worship of Jehovah (iii. 4, 5), at the same time that he rebukes the remnant of Baal-worship and other idolatry (i. 4, 5) (2), as well as from his still awaiting the destruction of Nineveh (ii. 13) (3), that he laboured after the reformation of worship had commenced, but before it was completed,—that is, between the twelfth and the eighteenth years of Josiah's reign (4); and that he supported the pious king in this work by his exhortations.

(1) Probably *king* Hezekiah, since otherwise no reason can be seen why the genealogy of the prophet for four generations should have been given, against the analogy of other superscriptions (*Hitzig*, p. 284; *Strauss*, p. vi. sq.; *Häv.* p. 393, and others, [among whom

Aben Ezra and *Eichhorn* are named by *Bleek*, p. 547, who himself thinks it not improbable]. Against this the objections of *Jahn* (Einl. ii. p. 536), *Rosenmüller*, and others, are unimportant. [*Delitzsch*, in the article on Zephaniah in *Herzog's* Real-Encycl., is one of these objectors: he thinks the expression would have been "the son of Hezekiah the king," or "king of Judah."]

(2) According to i. 4, compared with iii. 4, idolatrous priests (כְּמָרִים) stood side by side with legitimate priests. And according to i. 4, 5, Baal and the host of heaven were still publicly worshipped; while, according to 2 Kings xxiii. 4, 5, Josiah brought forth the vessels that were made for Baal, for Astarte, and for the whole host of heaven, and burned them outside Jerusalem, and put down the Chemarim. Consequently the reformation of worship, which began in the twelfth year of his reign, and was completed in the eighteenth, according to the more precise account in 2 Chron. xxxiv. 3, 8, could not yet have reached its termination.

(3) There is a controversy, to be sure, as to the year in which Nineveh was destroyed; but it can by no means be made to fall so late as the year B.C. 605 or 597, on account of what Herodotus relates of Cyaxares. For Abydenus and Alexander Polyhistor ascribe it to Nabopolassar, and bring it into the closest connection with his revolt from Saracus. Now in 597 Nabopolassar was no longer alive; and even in 606, the weakness of old age induced him to hand over the conduct of the war with the Egyptians to his son Nebuchadnezzar, who could not [?] at the same time have defeated Pharaoh Necho at Carchemish, and pursued him as far as Palestine, and also have taken Nineveh on the Tigris. Indeed, in this instance, Herodotus can be no authority, for the simple reason that he has entirely passed over the Chaldean dynasty, which existed between the Assyrian and the Medo-Persian dynasties. And the following consideration tells in favour of the common computation of the date of this event, B.C. 625, as even *Delitzsch*, Hab. xviii., confesses, although he does not coincide in the opinion; that, according to Berosus, Nabopolassar reigned twenty-one years, and that it is antecedently probable that the taking of the metropolis followed quickly upon his usurpation, if it was not the very commencement of it. Further, comp. my Comm. on Kings, p. 589 f.

(4) The prophecy is placed in the time *previous* to the eighteenth of Josiah by *Witsius*, *Buddeus*, *Jahn*, *v. Cölln*, *Knobel*, *Hitzig*, *De Wette*, *E. Meier*, *ibid.* p. 515, *Strauss*, and *Häv.* p. 395, [and this appears the more probable opinion to *Bleek*, p. 548]. It is placed *after* that year by *Carpzov*, *Eichhorn*, *Bertholdt*, and others; last of

all by *Delitzsch* [in *Herzog, ibid.*, and in his Commentary on Hab.], p. x.; because at i. 8 Zephaniah speaks of the king's sons, and therefore must have prophesied at a time when the two oldest sons of Josiah, Jehoiakim and Jehoahaz, were grown up, and had shown themselves deserving of punishment. [*Delitzsch* reasons ingeniously against the reply to this, that they might have been the children of a former king; comparison with other passages leading him to believe that the sons of the reigning king are meant, else the expression would have been the king's *brethren*.] But this does not follow from the threatening in i. 8; for it merely expresses the universality of the judgment, extending to all classes, even to the highest. Further, comp. *Strauss*, p. viii. sq., and *Häv.* p. 396, where the other reasons for this view are refuted.

The prophetic discourse of Zephaniah is fresh and lively. Yet, while it has many peculiar turns and images, on the whole it is less original; but it is rich in reminiscences, and in passages borrowed from the earlier prophets (5). The style is pure and easy.

(5) Comp. i. 7 with Hab. ii. 20, Joel i. 15, iv. 14, Isa. xxxiv. 16 [6?] and xiii. 3; i. 13 with Amos v. 11; i. 14, 15, with Joel ii. 1, 2; i. 16 with Amos ii. 2; i. 18 with Isa. x. 23 and xxviii. 22; ii. 8, 10, with Isa. xvi. 6 and Amos i. 13; ii. 14 with Isa. xiii. 21, 22, xxxiv. 11; ii. 15 with Isa. xlvii. 8, 10; iii. 10 with Isa. xviii. 1, 7; iii. 11 with Isa. xiii. 3; iii. 19 with Mic. iv. 6, 7. See *Küper*, Jerem. pp. 137 sq., 153 sq.; *Strauss*, p. xxviii.; and *Delitzsch*, Hab. p. viii.

§ 98. *The Book of Zephaniah.*

In the book of Zephaniah we certainly possess, not two prophecies, or three, but one lengthened comprehensive prophecy, the result of his official labours. It is wholly general in its character, announcing to the impenitent people of Judah, whose lives were spent without any longing after Jehovah (i. 6, ii. 1), the approaching day of the Lord's wrath not only upon Judah and Jerusalem, but at the same time upon all lands and nations far and near, for a warning to hardened sinners, and for the improvement of the penitent (i. 2–iii. 8); and it closes with the promise of the Messianic salvation which should dawn upon the delivered remnant of the pious, when the judgment had passed away (iii. 9–20) (1).

(1) Not only is it arbitrary to dismember the book into *three* discourses (*Eichhorn, Bertholdt, Knobel*, ii. p. 252): it is also unjustifiable to divide it into two prophecies, in the manner exhibited latest by *De Wette*, § 245, and *Strauss*, p. xv. *Ewald, Meier, ibid.* p. 514, and *Häv.* p. 391, have rightly acknowledged the unity of the whole. [This is precisely the view of *Bleek*, p. 547: "We possess one little book of his, consisting of a single connected utterance, with various pauses in the discourse, but these certainly not owing to the composition having been at different times."] For the prophecy begins with the threatening of judgment upon all ungodly and hardened sinners (ch. i.), and concludes with the promise of future salvation to the believing (iii. 9 ff.). Between these stands the exhortation to repentance and conversion, with the following motives addressed to the penitents: on the one hand, the reference to the judgment going forth over all the heathen; on the other hand, the prospect of deliverance to the true members of the theocracy who should turn to the Lord (ii. 1–8 [ii. 1–iii. 8?]).

This tendency of the prophecy to be general (2) was natural in the circumstances of the time; for just then the power of the Chaldeans began to rise in such a manner as to threaten danger to all nations (3).

(2) Long ago this was correctly recognised by *Bucer*: "Si cuncta quis desiderat secreta vatum oracula brevi dari compendio, brevem hunc Zaphanjam perlegat." And this circumstance furnishes the explanation of the prophet's leaning from first to last upon the older prophecies. That is, as the utterances of the older prophets had been only in part fulfilled by the Assyrians, for this reason Zephaniah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel take up anew the prophecies of those who went before them, because these were now to meet with a new and still more complete fulfilment at the hands of the Chaldeans; comp. *Caspari* in *Rudelbach* u. *Guericke's* Zeitschrift 1843, ii. p. 11, note, and *Hengstb.* Christol. ii. p. 395 ff.

(3) Against the opinion of *Cramer, Eichhorn, Movers, Hitzig, Ewald*, and *E. Meier*, that Zephaniah prophesied of the invasion of Palestine by the Scythians (Herod. i. 105), there are these considerations:—*a.* That Zephaniah does not give any more precise designation of the enemy, i. 7, iii. 15; but that in Jer. iv.–vi., where there has likewise been the wish to find the Scythians, the Chaldeans are most undoubtedly intended (comp. *Küper*, Jer. p. xiii. sq.). *b.* That the very narrative in Herodotus leaves it doubtful whether that invasion by the Scythians touched the kingdom of Judah. *c.* That Zephaniah's prophecy of the conquest and destruction of Jerusalem, and of

the chief cities of other kingdoms, does not suit the marauding incursions of the Scythians, who, like savage hordes as they were, did no more than plunder countries, and were satisfied with booty: comp. *Strauss*, p. xviii. sqq.; *Häv.* pp. 392–3; and *Maurer*, Comment. ii. p. 572. [In § 73, Note 3, additions, it has been observed that *Bleek*, p. 471, rejects the notion that the Scythians were intended by Jeremiah. Yet he seems to have wavered in his opinion, at least so far as Zephaniah is concerned; else there is a difficulty in explaining why he should say, p. 549, "Further, it is most probable that the composition took place about the time when the Scythians made their desolating inroads into Asia, extending them even to Palestine." In the same page he notices that in the ancient Christian Church an apocryphal writing existed, bearing Zephaniah's name, *ἀνάληψις* or *προφήτεια τοῦ Σοφονίου προφήτου*, which is quoted by *Clemens Alex.* Strom. v. p. 585, and *Pseudo-Epiphanius*, de vitis prophet.: and that in the Synopsis sacræ Scripturæ, and in *Nicephorus*, Stichometria, Num. 9, it is represented as among the apocryphal books of the Old Testament, and the latter gives its length as 600 stichoi.]

X. HAGGAI (חַגַּי).

Commentaries:—*Jo. Merceri*, Scholia et vers. ad proph. Hagg., Parisiis 1551. *J. Jac. Grynæi*, Comm. in Hagg., Genevæ 1581. *Fr. Balduini*, Comm. in Hagg., Zach., et Malach., Vitebergæ 1610; published afterwards along with *Joa. Schmidii*, Comm. in proph. min., Lipsiæ 1685, and often. *Balth. Willii*, prophetæ Hagg., Zach., Malach., comment. illustr., Bremæ 1638. *Aug. Varenii*, trifolium proph., s. tres posteriores proph., scil. Hagg., Zach., et Mal., explicati, Rostochii 1662, 4to; and his Exercitt. duæ in Hagg., *ibid.* 1648, 1650, 4to. *Andr. Reinbeck*, Exercitatt. in proph. Hagg., Brunsvici 1692, 4to. *Dan. Pfeffinger*, Notæ in proph. Hagg., Argentorati 1703, 4to. *Franc. Woken*, Annotatt. exeg. in proph. Hagg., Lipsiæ 1719, 4to. Vaticc. Haggæi vers. et illustr. a *Nic. Hesslen*, Lundis 1799, 4to. *J. Godofr. Scheibel*, Observatt. crit. et exeg. ad vaticc. Hagg. c. prolegg., Vratislaviæ 1822, 4to. [*T. V. Moore, D.D.*, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi, a new translation with notes, New York 1856.]

§ 99. *The Person of the Prophet.*

Haggai appeared as a prophet in the time of Zerubbabel and Joshua [the high priest], in the second year of Darius Hystaspis

(i. 1), in order to help forward the building of the temple, which had been brought to a stand by the laziness of the people, as well as by external hindrances (Ezra iv.). The aim of his warnings and exhortations was to induce the people to begin the building anew, and to carry it on; and he was successful (comp. i. 2, 4, with vers. 14, 15, ii. 3, 15, 18, Ezra v. 1, 2, vi. 14). We are destitute of any other information as to his person and the circumstances of his life (1).

The language of his discourses does not rise much above simple prose; although he does strive after rhythm, and seeks to give liveliness to the discourse by frequently making use of interrogation (2).

(1) See the traditions about him in *Carpzov*, p. 423 sqq., and *Knobel*, Prophetismus, ii. pp. 378–9. According to the Talmud, he was a member of the Great Synagogue. A mere mistake about ch. i. 13 has been the foundation of the opinion mentioned by *Jerome* on this passage: "Quidam putant, et Joannem Baptistam et Malachiam, qui interpretatur Angelus Domini, et Aggeum—fuisse angelos," etc. Against this see *Cyril. Alex.*, comm. ad h. l., and *Pseudo-Epiphanius*, c. xx.—The patristic statement, that he was one of the exiles who returned to their mother country with Joshua and Zerubbabel, is not improbable; and the same may be said of the conjecture of *Ewald*, ii. p. 516, that he belonged to that small number, once mentioned by him, ii. 3, who had seen the first temple. [*Bleek*, p. 549, coincides with *Keil* in this opinion, which he observes is also *Hävernick's*. He also remarks that the prophet's name is not found elsewhere, though we have חַגִּי, Gen. xlvi. 16.]

(2) For rhythm, comp. i. 6, 9, 10, ii. 6, 8, 22; for interrogation, i. 4, 9, ii. 3, 12, 13, 19. A favourite formula is שִׂימוּ לְבַבְכֶם, i. 5, 7, ii. 15, 18.

§ 100. *The Book of Haggai.*

Four discourses, with the precise date of each set down, are preserved to us in the book of Haggai, the memorials of his prophetic labours. They belong to the second year of Darius Hystaspis: they pursue one and the same object, and they stand connected with each other. They contain the substance of his spoken utterances, and were no doubt written down shortly after the discourses had been delivered. They are as follows:—*a.* An exhortation to build the temple, with a rebuke of the indifference of the people to this work,

and a motive added from the drought ordained by the Lord to come upon the land; to this is attached the statement of the result (ch. i.). *b.* Consolation to those who had resumed the building of the temple, but who took notice of the poor appearance of this new edifice; the promise of its future glorification in the highest possible degree (ii. 1–9). *c.* A rebuke of the predominant tendency among the people to outward righteousness by works, which withheld the divine blessing from them (ii. 10–19). *d.* The promise of the glorification awaiting Zerubbabel, that shoot of David's royal stem, amid the downfall of all earthly thrones (ii. 20–23) (1).

(1) The prophets after the exile had this calling in general, to explain to the people that present condition which was so hard for them to understand; to resolve the doubts which emerged in connection with the delay in the dawning of that Messianic salvation which the earlier prophets had announced; and to remove the hindrances among the people themselves to the fulfilment of the promises of God (comp. *Hengstb.* Christol. iii. p. 245 ff.; *Häv.* p. 398 ff.). In harmony with this, Haggai "represents in the most general form, yet in its principal features, the high significance of the present with reference to the future; and thus he compares the present house of God with the glorious future, and the present house of David with its high promises which remain for ever sure" (*Häv.* p. 401).

XI. ZECHARIAH (זְכַרְיָה).

Commentaries:—*Jo. Jac. Grynæi*, Comm. in Zachar., Genevæ 1581, 4to. *Casp. Sanctii*, Comm. in Zachar., Lugduni 1616, 4to. *Jo. H. Ursini*, Comm. in proph. Zachar., Francofurti 1652. *Sam. Bohl*, Analysis et exeges. prophetæ Zachar., Rostochii 1711. *Camp. Vitringa* and *H. Venema*; see § 224. *J. D. Fr. Burger*, Etudes exég. et crit. sur le proph. Zachar., Strasbourg 1841, 4to. *Koester*, Meletemata crit. et exeg. in Zachar. part. poster. c. ix.–xiv., Gottingæ 1818. *Ed. Forberg*, Comm. crit. et exeg. in Zachar. vatic. part. poster., Part i., Coburgi 1824, 4to. *M. Baumgarten*, die Nachtgesichte Zacharia's, eine Prophetenstimme an die Gegenwart, 2 Thle., Braunschweig 1854–5. [*Moore*; see under Haggai. *W. Neumann*, die Weissagungen des Sakharjah, Stuttgart 1860. *Kliefoth*, der Proph. Sacharjah, Schwerin 1862. *Köhler*, die nachexilischen Propheten, 2d and 3d vols., Erlangen 1861, 1863.]

For Introduction :—*B. G. Flügge* [*Bleek*, p. 553, says, an anonymous publication, the writer being a preacher in the neighbourhood of Hamburg, who died in 1792], die Weissagg. welche den Schriften des Zacharja beigebogen sind., Hamburg 1788. *Hengstenberg*, Beitr. z. Einl. in das Alte Test. B. i. p. 361 ff. (on the integrity of Zechariah). [*Von Ortenberg*, die Bestandtheile des Buches Sacharja, Gotha 1859.]

§ 101. *The Person of the Prophet.*

Zechariah, the son of Berechiah, and the grandson of Iddo (i. 1, 7) (1), who was a head of one of the priestly families, and who returned with Zerubbabel and Joshua from the exile (Neh. xii. 4), appeared as a prophet almost contemporaneously with Haggai (Ezra v. 1, vi. 14) only two months later; and he is named as a head of a priestly family under the high priest Joiakim (Neh. xii. 16). Called while yet a youth (ii. 8) [Eng. version ii. 4] to become a prophet, he attached himself to Haggai his senior, and carried forward the work which he had begun. He explained to his own time the word of the earlier prophets; he made use of promises and threatenings to guide the development of the theocracy forward to its goal; and he predicted very determinately how it was to assume shape in the future, as a blessing to believers and a judgment to the unbelieving.

(1) There is no foundation for supposing a contradiction in the circumstance that he is named בֶּן עִדּוֹא in Ezra v. 1, vi. 14: it only shows that בֶּן designates a grandson [as well as a son, its usual meaning], and that the grandfather was better known and more distinguished than the father, who probably died in early life, since the grandson succeeded the grandfather as head of the priestly house (Neh. xii. 4, 16). [*Bleek*, p. 551, notices the attempts of *Jerome* and *Cyril* to explain how Zechariah was the son of Berechiah and also the son of Iddo, according to their rendering. He himself, p. 565, having adopted the belief that the book of Zechariah is the work of various authors, is inclined to follow *Knobel* and *Ortenberg*, die Bestandtheile des B. Sacharja, Gotha 1859, and to think that there were two prophets whose designations have come to be confused in this superscription,—the one being Zechariah the son of Iddo, the other an earlier Zechariah the son of Berechiah. This hypothesis receives a passing notice from *Keil* afterwards, § 103, Note 5.] Since the grandfather had returned from exile along with Zerubbabel, and since

Zechariah is still named נַעַר (ii. 8), when he was called to become a prophet in the second year of Darius, that is, in the eighteenth year after the return, it follows that he must have left Babylon in his earliest childhood; and this brings out the erroneousness of the patristic statement, that Zechariah came out of Chaldea ἤδη προβεβηκώς, or "ætate jam provecta," or "senex". (*Pseudo-Epiphanius, Dorotheus, Isidore,* in *Knobel,* ii. p. 381).—See other conjectures about him in *Carpzov,* p. 436 sqq.

The modes of prophetic representation in Zechariah are manifold: its sphere is partly in visions and symbols (i. 8–vi. 15), partly in simple discourse (vii. and viii.), and in lofty prophetic intuitions and images (ix.–xiv.). The visions, which are written in plain prose, remind us strongly of Ezekiel's visions by a certain strange and half-foreign colouring (2). The prophetic discourse is rich in repetitions, is somewhat spun out, and is pretty uniform (3); yet along with this, especially in the delineations of the future, it is rich in bold original views, and in rare and forcible comparisons (for instance ii. 8, 9, ix. 15, 16, x. 3–5, xi. 7, 10, 14, xii. 3, 4, 6, 8, xiv. 4, 5, 20, 21), which betray a youthful fancy, fresh, excitable, and rich in imagery (4). The language is formed upon good classical models, and is almost free of Chaldaisms (5).

(2) The foreign colouring of the symbols, which reminds us of Chaldea, cannot be explained, with *Bertholdt,* p. 1699, and *De Wette,* § 248, by the supposition that the prophet received his education in Chaldea (against which comp. Note 1); but only in this way, partly by his leaning upon Ezekiel, and partly by the subsequent effect of the Babylonian influence on the whole body of the exiles. Comp. *Häv.* p. 406.

(3) Repetitions of prophetic formulas occur in i. 3, 4, i. 17 and ii. 16; ii. 13 and 15, iv. 9 and vi. 15; vii. 9, 10, and viii. 16, 17, etc.

(4) Comp. *Ewald,* ii. p. 522, who refers further to "the representation of a series of visions, very skilfully arranged and distinctly sketched." On the contrary, *Knobel* (ii. p. 384) and *De Wette* blame the spirit and the form of the book as one-sided and exaggerated. *Carpzov,* p. 444, long ago pronounced the right decision: "Stylo utitur visionibus abstrusis congruo, sublimi et gravi, sed non æque ac Jesaias, nitido ac puro, verum tali, qui inclinatam et decrepitam fere linguæ Hebrææ arguit ætatem."—The predominance of symbolical and metaphorical language, together with many harsh and

inelegant expressions, have rendered the book obscure and difficult to understand. Of this both Jewish and Christian expositors complain, though certainly not without strong exaggeration. Thus, not only does *Jerome*, prol. ad comm. l. i., call him "obscurissimum et inter duodecim longissimum;" but also he says, prol. ad l. ii., "Ab obscuris ad obscuriora transimus, et cum Moyse ingredimur in nubem et caliginem. Abyssus abyssum invocat in voce cataractarum Dei; et gyrans gyrando vadit Spiritus, et in circulos suos revertitur," etc. See especially the Rabbins in *Carpzov*, p. 445. Comp. *Hengstb.* Christol. iii. p. 250 ff.

(5) We have proof that the language was formed upon more ancient models, even in the resumption of words from the Pentateuch, like עָמִית, xiii. 7; אַלּוּף, ix. 7, xii. 5, 6; פִּי שְׁנַיִם, xiii. 8 (from Deut. xxi. 17; comp. 2 Kings ii. 9): all which had disappeared from the living language. It is proved still more plainly from the direct appeal to the writings of the earlier prophets (i. 4–6, vii. 7), and from the manifold use of them for the very expressions which are adopted: comp. iii. 8 and vi. 12 with Isa. iv. 2, Jer. xxiii. 5 and xxxiii. 15; iii. 10 with Mic. iv. 4; vi. 13 with Ps. cx. 4; vii. 14 and ix. 8 with Ezek. xxxv. 7 (מֵעֹבֵר וּמָשֹׁב) [where the prefix preposition is not used, however]; xi. 3 (גְּאוֹן הַיַּרְדֵּן from Jer. xii. 5, xlix. 19, l. 44); further, ix. 10 from Ps. lxxii. 8; xiii. 2 from Hos. ii. 19; xi. 4, 5, comp. with Jer. l. 6, 7; and other passages adduced by *Hengstb.* Beitr. i. p. 367 ff.—One Aramaism is אֶסְעֲרֵם for אֶסְעָרֵם. The *scriptio plena* דָּוִיד, xii. 7, and often, is found already in Hos. iii. 5, Amos vi. 5, ix. 11, and elsewhere. Yet the later age is betrayed by many hard constructions; for instance, the use of אֵת before incomplete sentences, vii. 7, viii. 17, like Hag. ii. 5; אַחַר כָּבוֹד, ii. 12; and others.

§ 102. *Contents of the Book of Zechariah.*

The writings of Zechariah manifestly contain *three* separate divisions:—I. A series of visions (ch. i. 7–vi.), which were revealed to the prophet in one night, the twenty-fourth day of the eleventh month of the second year of Darius Hystaspis (i. 7); and to this the vision in the eighth month of the same year (i. 1–6) forms the introduction. These visions, which stand in an intimate relation to each other, start from the present condition of Israel, represent the destiny of the new theocracy, its goal and its glorification, with an ever increasing precision in the delineation of its several conditions and relations; and thus they give a complete picture of the future

fortunes of the people of God. II. A consolatory discourse, containing many promises, which was occasioned by a question and a petition, addressed by the people to the Lord (vii. and viii.). III. A prophetic delineation of the future fortunes of the theocracy; in which the temporary and local relations of the present fall into the background, and the Messianic views predominate: this is divided into two discourses by the superscriptions ix. 1 and xii. 1. In the *first* of these (ix.–xi.), the struggle of the theocracy with the powers of the world is predicted, its victory and their subjection, by the appearing of the Messiah, and under His official authority as the Shepherd. In the *second* (xii.–xiv.), there are predicted the last assaults of the powers of the world upon Jerusalem; the conversion of Israel to the Messiah, whose death had been caused by the sin of the people; the ruin of the old theocracy, the annihilation of all the foes who fight against the Lord, and the final completion and glorification of the kingdom of God. These prophecies are not defined more precisely by any statements of dates; but yet unquestionably they belong to the latter times, since they contain the completion of the earlier utterances. The entire want of dates is to be explained from the contents of these utterances, which are independent of determinate relations of time, and are wholly occupied with the future (1).

(1) Comp. *Hengstb.* Christol. iii. p. 249 f.; *Häv.* p. 415 f.; and *Neumann* in *Schneider's* deutsch. Zeitschrift f. chr. Wissensch. 1855, No. 28 f.

§ 103. *Genuineness of the Last Part, ch.* ix.–xiv.

The first doubts as to the genuineness of ch. ix.–xiv. were stirred by men who remarked that the passage Zech. xi. 12, 13 was quoted in Matt. xxvii. 9 as an utterance of the prophet Jeremiah. But after this, in later times, these chapters have been pronounced not to be Zechariah's, partly on account of the difference in the form, but especially on account of many things being mentioned which did not seem to correspond with the state of matters after the exile. Certain critics, indeed, transposed them to a much later age, but the majority attributed them to some prophet earlier than the exile (1). However, any differences in style and language which can be perceived in the

two parts of the book lay no foundation for such a real distinction as would interfere with the unity of authorship. A closer comparison rather brings out a great affinity to the first part, not only in language and style of composition (2), but also in dependence upon earlier prophetic writings; some of which, however, are so very late as to exclude the possibility that these chapters were composed before the exile (3).—The contents also plainly presuppose the exile; while the entire historical basis of the prophecy is unsuited to the historical circumstances before the exile took place (4).

(1) On the ground of the quotation in Matt. xxvii. 9, several English scholars in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries (*Mede* [1653], *Whiston* [1722], *Kidder, Bridge, Hammond, Newcome*) affirmed that ch. ix.–xiv. did not belong to Zechariah, but wholly or in part to Jeremiah. [*Bleek*, p. 553, says that the English writers attributed ch. ix.–xi. to Jeremiah, but that the whole six chapters were denied to be Zechariah's by *Döderlein* in 1787.] See the literature in *Bertholdt*, iv. pp. 1707–8, and *Köster*, meletem. critt. p. 10 sqq. [to which *Ortenberg*, die Bestandtheile des B. Sacharja, pp. 1–13, is added by the editor of *Bleek*, p. 554, note. Among the German divines who adopted this opinion, *Bleek*, p. 553, names one or two more than *Keil* names in the next few lines: they are inserted within brackets].—Their genuineness was first assailed in Germany by *Flügge*, in the anonymous publication formerly named; followed by *J. D. Michaelis*, *Corrodi* (Beleuchtung des Bibelkanons, i. p. 107), *Bertholdt*, *De Wette* (Einl. ed. 1–3), [*G. L. Bauer*, *Augusti*, *Eichhorn*, ed. 4], *Forberg* (Comment. in Zach.), *Rosenmüller* [Schol. ed. 2], *Maurer*, *Hitzig* (theol. Studien u. Krit. 1830, p. 25 ff., and in his Commentary on the Minor Prophets), *Knobel* (Prophetismus, ii. 166 ff., 280 ff.), *Ewald* (Proph. i. p. 308 ff.), *E. Meier* (*ibid.* p. 495 ff.), *Bleek* (theol. Studien u. Krit. 1852, p. 247 ff. [pp. 247–332, and repeated in his Einl. pp. 554–565]), and *Herzfeld* (Geschichte, i. pp. 280–1), [also by *Bunsen*, Gott in der Geschichte, i. p. 449 ff., and by *Ortenberg*]. However, they are so little at one about the origin of the pieces in question, that, for instance, *Forberg*, *Rosenmüller*, and *Hitzig* attribute them to a prophet in the time of Uzziah, [a view abandoned by *Hitzig* for the common one of the critics, in the second edition of his Commentary; see *Bleek*, p. 554]; whereas *Corrodi*, *Eichhorn*, *Paulus*, *Gramberg*, place its origin long after the exile, some of them in the time of Alexander, some in the Maccabean period. On the contrary, the most of the remaining critics place ch. ix.–xi. (to which *Ewald*, in

the Zeitschrift f. d. Kunde des Morgenl. i. 3, p. 330, would subjoin xiii. 7–9 [an opinion which *Bleek*, p. 562, unceremoniously pronounces to be "falsch," without arguing the point]) in the time of Ahaz, and ch. xii.–xiv. after Josiah, but yet before the exile.—On the contrary, the genuineness has been defended by *Carpzov*, critica sacr. p. 808; *Beckhaus*, Integrität der prophet. Schriften, p. 337 ff.; *Jahn*, Einl. ii. p. 675 ff.; *Köster*, meletem.; *Hengstb.* Beitr. i. p. 361 ff.; *Burger*, Etudes, p. 118 sqq.; *Herbst*, Einl. ii. 2, pp. 163–4; and *Häv.* p. 408 ff. [to whom *Bleek*, p. 553, adds *Friedr. Burk*, *Umbreit*, and *Stähelin*, die messian. Weissagg. des Alt. Test., Berlin 1847, pp. 125 ff., 173–177]. In favour of this view *De Wette* also declared himself in the latest editions of his Einleitung.

(2) Common to both is the rare expression מֵעוֹבֵר וּמִשָּׁב, vii. 14 and ix. 8, and הֶעֱבִיר in the sense of "removing," iii. 4 and xiii. 2 (as used elsewhere only by later writers, 2 Chron. xv. 8, 2 Kings xvi. [?] 3); the symbolical designation of divine providence as the eye of God, iii. 9, iv. 10, ix. 1, 8; the peculiarity, all through, of using the parts as a circumlocution for describing the whole, comp. v. 4 and xiii. 1, 3; the designation of the theocracy as the house of Judah, or of Israel, or of Ephraim, or of Joseph, i. 12, ii. 2, 16, viii. 15, ix. 13, x. 6, xi. 14, and elsewhere. Further, compare the thorough accord between ii. 14 and ix. 9; the very similar turn of the thought in ii. 13, 15, and in xi. 11; the similarity of manner in viii. 14 and xiv. 5 [?]; and in spite of the effort made to acquire a pure style artificially, the Chaldaisms which still occur—צָבָה for צָבָא, ix. 8; רָאֲמָה for רָמָה, xiv. 10; בָּחַל [xi. 8] (elsewhere only Prov. xx. 21 [*Kethib*]); מִלֵּא קֶשֶׁת for דָּרַךְ קֶשֶׁת, ix. 13. Comp. *Hengstb.* Christol. iii. pp. 385–6. —On the other hand, there is a sufficient explanation of the alleged differences in the style, such as the want in the second part of the formulas frequent in the first part: "Then lifted I up my eyes, and saw," ii. 1, 5, v. 1, vi. 1; "And the word of Jehovah came unto," i. 7, iv. 8, vi. 9, vii. 1, 4, 8, viii. 1, 18; "Thus saith Jehovah of hosts," i. 4, 16, 17, ii. 12, viii. 2, 4, 6, and often [these formulas, however, not being quite uniform throughout]: whereas in the second part בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא is more frequent (ix. 16, xi. 11, xii. 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11, xiii. 1, 2, 4, xiv. 4, 6, 8, and often, compared with ii. 15, iii. 10, vi. 10). The explanation is, that the first part contains visions and exhortations addressed to contemporaries, while the second contains prophetic delineations of the future: comp. the similar relation of Hos. i.–iii. to iv.–xiv. On the same principle another difference of the two parts is explained, inasmuch as the language of the second part soars more loftily and poetically, so that *Hitzig* incorrectly sees in this a contrast

of insipid, feeble prose, and of lively, forcible rhythm; whereas the fact is, that in ii. 14 ff. the discourse is elevated poetry, and in xi. 4 ff. it descends to prosaic representation (comp. *Häv.* p. 414 f.); and in both parts it is characterized by a similar powerful imagination (*Hengstb.* Beitr. i. p. 371).

(3) Besides those references in the second part to Jeremiah which have been already noticed, § 101, Note 5, compare further, in particular, ix. 5 with Zeph. ii. 4; xi. 4 with Ezek. xxxiv. 4; xiii. 8, 9, with Ezek. v. 12; xiv. 8 with Ezek. xlvii. 1–12; xiv. 10, 11, with Jer. xxxi. 38–40; xiv. 20, 21, with Ezek. xliii. 12, xliv. 9; xiv. 16–19 with Isa. lxvi. 23 and lx. 12.

(4) In x. 6, and indeed in ix. 12 also, it is assumed that Judah and Israel had been in exile. Further, the mention of Javan [that is, Greece] as the representative of the worldly power hostile to the theocracy, ix. 13, rests upon the prophecies of Daniel, viii. 5 ff., 21 ff., concerning the relation of the Greco-Macedonian monarchy to the theocracy. [*Bleek*, pp. 556–7, connects the mention of Greece with Joel iv. 6: he conjectures that Hadrach was the prince of Damascus, and thinks that Hamath and Gaza must then have been independent kingdoms, ix. 1, 2, 5. On this account he dates the prophecy in the time of Uzziah instead of in that of Darius Hystaspis.] In xii. 11 reference is made to the death of Josiah, as to an event in time past (2 Chron. xxxv. 25); *Hitzig's* remarkable mode of escape has already been refuted by *Maurer*. Then there is nowhere a thought of a king, but only of rulers in general, and of the family of David (xii. 7, 8, 12, xiii. 1), yet not as actually reigning, but only as destined to be anew exalted gloriously in the future (*Hengstb.* Beitr. i. p. 374). Finally, we are led on to the age after the exile by the prominence given to priests and Levites, xii. 12, 13, and to the feast of tabernacles, xiv. 16 comp. with Ezra iii. 4, Neh. viii. 17, and by the advanced development of the Messianic idea; comp. *Häv.* pp. 424–5. On the contrary, everything which has been turned to account as proof that these chapters were composed before the exile, is seen on nearer inspection to be untenable. Nothing is proved by the circumstance that the second part does not mention Satan, the seven eyes of God, the Angel, and such like; for neither do they occur in ch. vii. and viii. Damascus, Tyre, Philistia, Assyria, and Egypt (ix. 1–6, x. 10) are indeed named as enemies of Judah. [*Bleek* again uses this as an argument for an earlier date of composition. At pp. 557–8 he makes the mention of Assyria and Egypt refer to times such as Isa. xi. 11, xxvii. 13, Hos. xi. 10, 11, describe; and he understands the return of Joseph or Ephraim to *Gilead* and *Lebanon* as indications of

a partial captivity, 2 Kings xv. 29, 1 Chron. v. 6, 26. Also, p. 559, he remarks upon ch. xi., that ver. 14 implies the existence of the two kingdoms of Israel and Judah, as ver. 6 shows that they had a king of their own, and ver. 8 points to the anarchy in the time of the downfall of the house of Jehu.] But it is explained by this: that the first-named states still maintained their hostile relation to the theocracy even after the exile; and that the last two come under consideration merely as types and representatives of the enemies of the kingdom of God, since they were the first great worldly powers which assumed an attitude of hostility towards the theocracy. The brief allusions to teraphim, false prophets, and idols (x. 2, xiii. 2), do not presuppose any continuance of the sway of gross idolatry, such as existed before the exile, but only such forms of idolatry as were not wholly absent even after the exile: comp. Neh. vi. 10–14; Ezra ix. 2 ff.; Neh. xiii. 23. [*Bleek*, p. 561, thinks that this struggle with idolatry is just the same as that found in Jeremiah, Zephaniah, and Ezekiel; whereas no such polemic is to be found in the first part of Zechariah, nor in Haggai or Malachi, nor in the books of Ezra and Nehemiah.] Everything else rests upon misunderstanding and misinterpretation.

In addition to all this, there can be the less doubt about the genuineness of these chapters, since a mingling of genuine and spurious pieces in the book of Zechariah becomes at once inconceivable on this ground, that the collection of the Canon was scarcely a lifetime after the death of this prophet,—at a time when sure historical traditions must have still been in existence as to the origin of the writings subsequent to the exile (5). But if their genuineness cannot be disturbed, then Zechariah himself has taken charge of the publication of the entire book, considering the internal connection of its three divisions, § 102.

(5) [*Bleek's* reply to this is as follows, p. 564: "The collection of the prophets, and therefore also that of the twelve minor prophets, was most probably accomplished by the care of Nehemiah, as we shall see, somewhere about eighty years after Darius Hystaspis, the prince under whom Zechariah prophesied, at a time when this prophet was certainly no longer in life. It is therefore quite conceivable that the collector, by an oversight, might attribute to Zechariah, along with his own prophecies, also some which belonged to another prophet and another age. So long as the predictions of a prophet were still circulated in single sheets, and not yet united in a closed collection with

canonical authority, it might happen, even within a shorter period, that utterances of various authors, and at various times, might be written together, and might then ever after be considered to be writings of the same author; if such utterances, as was at least often the case, were given out one by one, and without expressly designating the author, and were also collected at a later time by other persons than the authors." Most readers will probably reckon it unnecessary to refute these remarks at any length.] In general, the hypothesis of our opponents is destitute of historical testimony. For the quotation Matt. xxvii. 9, where Jeremiah is named instead of Zechariah, is to be explained from this circumstance, that the prophecy in question, which is Zechariah's, points back to Jer. xviii. and xix. as the fundamental passage (comp. *Hengstb.* Christol. iii. p. 459 ff.). And Zechariah the son of Jeberechiah, who is mentioned in Isa. viii. 2, was no prophet. [*Bleek*, p. 564, inclines to think him the author of ch. ix.–xi., considering him to have been a disciple of Jehovah, according to Isa. viii. 16, as he understands that verse, and so perhaps a prophet: in this he follows a conjecture of *Bertholdt*, along with *Gesenius* on Isaiah, i. 327–8, *Knobel*, and *Bunsen*.] And the seer Zechariah, who lived under Uzziah (2 Chron. xxvi. 5), cannot come under consideration, for this plain reason, that ch. xiii. and xiv. cannot possibly have been by him; and the assumption of two different authors of the chapters in question, in the face of the fact which *Hitzig* (klein. Proph. p. 349) himself admits, that these sections "without this have manifold bonds of connection, external as well as internal," remains a desperate expedient. [*Bleek*, pp. 560–1, holds that ch. xii. 1–xiii. 6 is of later date than the death of Josiah, on account of xii. 11; and that Judah and Jerusalem are spoken of as all that remained of the people of God. On the other hand, he thinks it unlikely that Zechariah, after the exile, should have spoken as the writer here does of Jerusalem, as the capital of an independent kingdom, the object of hostile attacks, and of the house of David as reigning over it, and needing to repent more than all the rest of the people. At pp. 562–3 he makes ch. xiii. 7–xiv. 21 one prophecy, composed long after Uzziah's time, on account of xiv. 5; and after the Ten Tribes had been carried away, on account of xiv. 10*a*, yet while there was still a king in Judah, xiii. 7: but not written after the exile, else in xiii. 8, 9, xiv. 1, 2, he would expect a reference to the earlier but still recent taking of Jerusalem by the Chaldeans; and at xiv. 18, 19, Egypt appears as the chief hostile heathenish power. These arguments will probably not greatly alter the convictions of many.]

XII. MALACHI (מַלְאָכִי).

Commentaries:—*Dav. Chytræi*, explic. Malach. proph., Rostochii 1568, Opp. ii. 455. *J. Jac. Grynæi*, Hypomnemata in Malach., Genevæ 1582, Basileæ 1583, 1612, 4to. *Sam. Bohlii*, Malach. proph. cum commentt. Rabbinorum, etc., Rostochii 1637, 4to. *J. Henr. Ursini*, Comment. in Malach., Francofurti 1652. *Sal. van Til*, Malach. illustratus, Lugduni Batavorum, 1701, 4to. *Joa. Wesselii*, Malach. enucleatus, Lubecæ 1729, 4to. Malachiæ proph. cum Targum Jonath. et Radaki, Raschii, et Aben-Ezræ, comment. interpretatio a *J. Chr. Hebenstreit* (xvii Diss. and Progr.), Lipsiæ 1731–46, 4to. *H. Venemæ*, Comment. § 224. *C. F. Bahrdt*, Comment. in Malachiam, cum examine crit. verss. vet. et lection. var. Houbigantii, Lipsiæ 1768. *J. M. Faber*, Comment. in Malach. proph., Onold. 1779, 4to. *Laur. Reinke*, d. Proph. Maleachi Einl. Grundtext, u. Uebers. nebst philol. krit. u. histor. Comment., Giessen 1856. [*Moore;* see under Haggai.]

§ 104. *Person and Age of the Prophet.*

So little is known of the person of *Malachi*, that his name has actually been called in question, the attempt having been made to explain it as an appellative (1). We gather from the contents of his prophecy that he was a contemporary of Nehemiah, and prophesied during his second visit to Jerusalem (after the thirty-second year of Artaxerxes Longimanus), and supported his reformatory efforts by prophetic words of consolation and threatening. In favour of this there is the testimony borne by the agreement, almost word for word, between his delineation of his countrymen and contemporaries and the description in Neh. xiii.; particularly the rebukes on account of marrying heathen wives, on account of bringing worthless offerings, and on account of neglecting payment of tithes (comp. ii. 10–16 with Neh. xiii. 23 ff.; iii. 7–12 with Neh. xiii. 10 ff.; ii. 8 with Neh. xiii. 15 ff.) (2). We infer that he appeared later than Haggai and Zechariah, not only from his never being named in the book of Ezra, but also from the circumstance that it is assumed in his writings that the building of the temple was already completed, and that the worship in it was again fully organized (i. 10, iii. 1).

(1) [*Bleek*, p. 566, observes that this proper name occurs nowhere else in the Old Testament, and this circumstance may have favoured the notion that it was an appellative.] Already the Septuagint translate the superscription, *Λῆμμα λόγου Κυρίου ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰσραὴλ ἐν χειρὶ ἀγγέλου αὐτοῦ* [with which may perhaps be compared the fancy that Haggai and he were angels; see § 99, Note 1]; and on i. 1 *Jonathan* remarks, "Malachi, whose name is called Ezra the scribe." The somewhat widely diffused opinion, that Malachi was not the prophet's actual name, but was only an official title, cannot be justified, although it has certainly found eloquent defenders in *Vitringa*, Observatt. sacr. l. vi. p. 331 sqq., and *Hengstb.* Christol. iii. p. 583 ff. [*Bleek*, p. 566, says that *Jerome* speaks of this view as that of the Jews in his time, and seems himself to approve of it. Among its modern supporters he names *Simonis*, Onomasticon, p. 298; but he himself adheres to the common opinion.] Already *Carpzov*, p. 455, remarks excellently in opposition to it: "At enim vero hoc si liceat, etiam Obadjæ et Hoseæ nomina in appellativa transmutare omnemque demum historiam hac nominum confusione turbare licebit. Quin potius constantem urgemus scripturæ propheticæ morem, ex quo vaticiniorum scriptores propriis, quæ ex circumcisione retulerunt, nominibus suis in fronte operum designantur, allegorica vero quadam aut ambigua delineari appellatione et sic in dubio relinqui non consueverunt." That the name is significant proves nothing. "The name of Elijah, too, is extremely significant for the problem of the life of the great man who bore it, and for his peculiar working; so also is the name of Isaiah for the principal contents of his prophecies, as well as for his own typical character; but this does not imply that these men had assumed their names only at a later time, on account of their significance" (*Caspari*, Mich. p. 28), or that the names were merely symbolical. And the form מַלְאָכִי, contracted from מַלְאָכְיָה, is justified by אֲבִי, 2 Kings xviii. 2, = אֲבִיָּה, 2 Chron. xxix. 1. Comp. *Häv.* p. 431, and the proof laid down at full length by *Caspari, id.*

(2) This view has been so well established in *Vitringa's* dissertation de Malach. proph., in his Observatt. sacr. *l.c.*, that it cannot be shaken by the unimportant objections of *Hitzig*, klein. Proph. p. 389 f.; *Herbst*, Einl. ii. p. 169 f.; and *Maurer*, Comm. p. 717. Comp. *Häv.* p. 432 ff. [*Bleek*, pp. 566–7, admits the strength of the common opinion, among whose supporters he also names *Jahn*, *Rosenmüller*, *Bertholdt*, and *Hengstb.*; yet with *Ewald* and *Reinke* he prefers the other view, attaching weight to *Hitzig's* objection, that the offerings to the governor, i. 8, do not suit the account given by Nehemiah of himself, ch. v. 14 ff., and point rather to some Persian governor. But as the

prophetic Canon seems to have been formed in Nehemiah's time, he would place Malachi a little earlier, and not later.]

§ 105. *The Book of Malachi.*

The writings of Malachi contain a connected prophecy as to the relation of Jehovah to His people. It is divisible into *three* sections. The *first* (i. 2–ii. 9) represents Jehovah's loving, fatherly, long-suffering, and compassionate disposition toward the covenant people. The *second* (ii. 10–16) represents Him as the only God and Father. The *third* (ii. 17–iii. 24) represents Him as the righteous and eternal Judge of His people; and to them it points out how they sin against their God by their external and hypocritical worship, by their faithlessness toward the Lord manifested in marriages with heathen wives, and by their murmuring at the absence of divine judgments: but God shall appear as the strict Judge of all the ungodly, and as the Sun of Righteousness to those that fear His name; and preparation shall be made for His appearing by the sending of a second Elijah (1).

(1) The book is divided into three sections by *Ewald*, ii. p. 542, and by *Häv.* p. 427; whilst *six* sections are assumed by *Hengstb.* Christol. iii. p. 590 ff., *De Wette*, and *Maurer*,—namely, i. 2–5, i. 6–ii. 9, ii. 10–16, ii. 17–iii. 6, iii. 7–12, iii. 13–24. [*Bleek*, pp. 567–8, reckons *five* sections, by combining the first and second of these into one.] *Ewald* finds in the book learned dissertation rather than living discourse. More correctly, *Häv.*, p. 430, judges that oral discourses lie at the basis of the work; and that their original character is not entirely effaced in the present form of the composition, but that it sets before us a general survey of the weightiest impelling forces in the prophet's active life.

In correspondence with the subject-matter is the form of representation, which is strongly distinguished from the more dramatic delineations of the older prophets by an approach to the tutorial method of dialogue; and which consequently is not distinguished by soaring enthusiasm, but rather comprehends within its glance the practical want of the time, and strives to teach and to reform by antithetical propositions, and by sentences laden with important matter (2). Along with this, the matter is carefully arranged in

strophes; and the language has preserved its beauty and polish extremely well, considering the lateness of the date (3).

(2) *De Wette's* judgment, § 252, is incorrect: "One feels everywhere the flatness and deadness of spirit, which can indeed make attempts, but always ineffectively, and which is no longer master of its materials." Against this, comp. *Häv.* p. 427. In the dialogue form, with the somewhat monotonous turn of expression, a short proposition being set down, then the doubting questions of the people brought up in opposition to it, then the answer given at large, we can scarcely avoid noticing the influence exerted on prophetic discourse by the method of the schools which were rising up. Yet this is of no value as a proof that prophecy was dying out.

(3) Comp. *Ewald, ibid.*

THIRD DIVISION.

THE HOLY WRITINGS (כְּתוּבִים, Ἁγιόγραφα).

§ 106. *Classification of them.*

THE *Holy Writings* of the Old Testament represent the religious life of the most eminent bearers of the theocratic spirit among the covenant people, as that life was developed internally; or else they describe how it took shape externally—that life which was awakened and nourished in them by divine revelation. In respect of their matter and their form, these writings fall into three classes—(1) the *poetical writings*, (2) the *prophetical book of Daniel*, and (3) the *sacred histories*. They have this mark common to them all, which combines them into one division of the canonical writings, as distinguished both from the *Law* and from the *Prophets* (or *prophetical books*, whether historical or predictive), that they want the constitutive and regulative significance of the writings of Moses for the theocracy, and that they are not the immediate products of the conservative and yet developing activity of the prophets. But they grew up on the spiritual soil of the old covenant, prepared and hallowed as this was by supernatural divine revelation; and in general, and with reference to the principal part of their contents, they are to be considered less as proceeding from immediate divine inspiration, than mainly as mediate results of divine revelation, or products of the divine and spiritual life begotten in Israel by the Law and Prophecy, which were ordained for the internal and external edification of the theocracy. [Some of these expressions, we think, must appear objectionable to an intelligent believer in the plenary inspiration of Scripture. Yet the most of what *Keil* says, and perhaps all that he would be anxious to say, might be expressed unexceptionably without any great change in his language.]

CHAPTER I.

THE POETICAL WRITINGS.

Rob. Lowth, de sacra poesi Hebræorum prælectt. acad., Oxoniæ 1753, 4to, and often. Notas et epimetra adj. *J. D. Michaelis*, ii Partes, ed. 2, Gottingæ 1770. Suis animadverss. adjectis ed. *E. F. K. Rosenmueller*, Lipsiæ 1815. *J. Gf. v. Herder*, vom Geiste der ebräischen Poesie, Dessau 1782–3, Leipzig 1787, 2 Thle. Sorgfältig durchgesehene u. mit mehreren Zusätzen verm. Ausg. v. *K. W. Justi*, Leipzig 1825, 2 Thle. (also often in *Herder's* works). *J. G. Wenrich*, de poeseos Hebraic. atque Arab. orig. indole mutuoque consensu atque discrimine commentat., Lipsiæ 1843. *Jos. Lev. Saalschütz*, v. d. Form der hebr. Poesie, nebst e. Abhandlung ü. die Metrik der Hebr., Königsberg 1825. Also, his Form u. Geist der bibl. hebr. Poesie, Königsberg 1853. *E. Meier*, die Form der hebr. Poesie, Tübingen 1853; also, his Geschichte d. poet. National-Literatur der Hebr., Leipzig 1856. *Heinr. Ewald*, die poet. BB. des Alten Test. erklärt, 4 Theile, Göttingen 1835–39 (Th. i., Allgemeines üb. d. hebr. Poesie u. das Psalmbuch) [third ed. published in 1866 under the title, die Dichter d. Alten Bundes]. *E. Meier*, die poet. BB. des Alten Test. übersetzt u. erklärt, 4 Abthll., Stuttgart 1850–53.

§ 107. *Character of Hebrew Poetry, and its Different Species.*

Hebrew poetry is a fruit of religion. We have not to seek for its origin in external occasions of one sort or another, perhaps in warlike occurrences or the like (1). But as the entire life of the Israelites was supported and animated by the testimonies of the Lord, His promises and His saving acts, and was directed and conducted by the revealed law to the higher truths of religion as the ideal and the aim of spiritual effort; so this might also be said of the holy feelings and moods awakened by the glorious manifestations of the divine righteousness and grace which filled the minds of pious theocratic men, and inspired them for songs, and hymns of praise, and holy poems. And the Hebrew poetry of the Old Testament has remained so thoroughly true to its origin, in all its forms and steps of development, that not only secular poetry never was able to spring up and thrive alongside

of sacred poetry (2), but also the times of liveliest religious excitement were the most fruitful in the fostering and culture of poetry (3), whose sole aim ever continued to be the furtherance of the spiritual life and the diffusion of religious truths among the people.

(1) As is supposed by *Eichhorn*, Einl. v. p. 1 ff.; *De Wette*, Comm. üb. die Psalmen, p. 7; *Winer*, bibl. Real-Wörterbuch, ii. p. 314 ff.; *Wenrich*, pp. 26 sq., 53 sq.

(2) The times of Moses, of David and Solomon, and later, the time of the exile. Comp. the historical sketch of Hebrew poetry in *Häv.* Einl. iii. p. 5 ff.

(3) This is plainly deducible from Amos vi. 5, of those who "invent to themselves instruments of music, like David;" according to which the Davidic psalm-poetry was the model on which it was attempted to form the secular poetry also.

Only two species of poetry were cultivated, suitably to its origin and character,—namely, the *lyric* and the *didactic*. The former was suitable where the poets gave utterance to the impression which the divine revelations in act and in word made upon the heart and mind, in the lyric form of religious sentiments, feelings, and moods; the latter, where they made them an object of instruction, and clothed them in the garb of gnomes and ethical proverbs for the diffusion of religious knowledge, and for the awakening of holy resolutions bearing on life and conduct. In individual cases, indeed, we cannot always distinguish these two forms very sharply: for, on the one hand, the lyrical effusions of inspired feeling contain a rich treasure of instruction, and often pass over into the territory of reflection; on the other hand, the didactic poetry of the proverbs is not unfrequently elevated to lyrical descriptions. Nevertheless the distinction is well-founded; and it is even stamped upon the language in a decided manner by the appellations שִׁיר and מָשָׁל (4).

The remaining species of poetry among other nations—namely, the epic and the dramatic—remained foreign to the ancient Hebrews. For the cultivation of the epic there was wanting not only, first, the material demanded by it, since divine revelation knows of no mythology, no legends of gods and heroes: but also, secondly, an essential condition, an absolutely free attitude towards religion, which would secure to the poet's fancy the wished-for room to play, in order to

treat in an epic of the great doings of God in the history of Israel; since the holy and ethical earnestness of the divine law excluded beforehand every transformation of the facts of revelation for the purposes of epic poetry (5). Among the Israelites there were also necessarily wanting the foundations indispensable for dramatic poetry, —the predominance of an æsthetic interest in art, the prevalence of a worldly way of thinking, and a sort of background in the direction of the *naturally* individual; conditions which were not favoured, but hindered and very much confined, by the spiritual principle of Old Testament revelation. It is true that the lyric poems, as well as the descriptions of the prophets, many a time assume a sort of dramatic character; since lively descriptions of conditions, relations, and spiritual intuitions, come almost involuntarily to be represented dramatically. Yet, for the reasons now assigned, such liveliness of representation is essentially different from dramatic poetry and the drama; and among all the poetical writings of the Old Testament, not a poem is to be found which, along with alternate discourse, presents alternate acting by different persons and individual characters in their development, —no drama in which the action advances along with the dialogue, and completes it (6).

(4) The whole of the Psalms, Canticles, and Lamentations, belong to the category of שִׁיר, besides the songs and hymns of praise inserted in the historical and prophetical writings, and interwoven with them: to the category of the מָשָׁל belong the Proverbs of Solomon; the discourses of the book of Job, in spite of its soaring, lyrical style; and the reflections of the Preacher. The so-called didactic psalms, which also are often classed with the didactic poetry, still belong to lyric poetry, notwithstanding the predominant purpose of giving instruction. For "the didactic poetry of the Psalms is distinguished from that of the Proverbs by the overflow of sentiment, the outcome from an agitated heart; in contrast to the rest, the objectivity, and the reflection of the Proverbs of Wisdom, in which the poetry is not an internal necessity, but only an agreeable form, and accordingly is not accompanied by song and music" (*Hengstb.* Psalmen, iv. p. 546).

(5) *Ewald* (poett. BB. i. p. 15) finds still another reason for the want of epic poetry among the Hebrews and the other Shemitic races, in the peculiarity of their character. For he says that a quality necessary for epic poetry, "the patient, long-breathing rest and retirement of thought, the sustained self-command in poetical inspiration, the

art of remaining clear and calmly self-possessed in protracted tension; all this is just as foreign to the Shemite as it is natural and easy to the Indo-German. Rapidity of feeling and of action; inwardness and liveliness of a simple, easily excited, susceptible mind; the highest tension of the imagination, thereafter to be quickly relaxed,—all this belongs more to the Shemite, who is a born lyric, but not an epic poet."

(6) The supposition that there is an epic poem in the Pentateuch (see above, § 37 [Note 4]) has met with little favour. In earlier, but especially in more recent times, more favour has been accorded to the opinion that Job and Canticles are dramatic poems. Thus, not only has *Fr. Böttcher* (die ältesten Bühnendichtungen, Leipzig 1850) attempted to explain the song of Deborah and the Canticles as if they were formal pieces for the stage, and to give them a suitable shape: *Hupfeld* also, "on the position and significance of the book of Job in the Old Testament, according to its didactic and dramatic character," in *Schneider's* deutsch. Zeitschrift f. christ. Wissenschaft, 1850, No. 35 ff., finds a drama in the book of Job. Even *Delitzsch*, d. Hohelied, p. 80, declares, "We do not hesitate to assert that Job and Canticles represent the sacred tragedy and comedy which took shape within Israel in that unprecedented age of Solomon." But this assertion rests upon a false interpretation of Canticles, as if it referred to the relations of mere natural love; and in the case of Job, on an interchange of the dialogue with the drama. But not to speak of this, or of the copious refutation with respect to Job already given by *Lowth*, de sacra poesi Hebræor. prælect. xxxiii., the opinion is irreconcilable with the theocratic character of the popular Israelite life. For there is not a shadow of a proof that the Israelite popular festivals—for instance, the one at Shiloh, which the Israelite women celebrated with dances—stood in connection with dramatic dances and farces. And should the connection between the Indian and the Greek drama, which has been assumed by *Otfr. Müller*, Geschichte der griech. Liter. ii. p. 24 ff., not be confirmed historically (as *Delitzsch* asserts, though certainly without proof), so that the dramatic literature of each of these peoples has its own genuine national commencement; yet this will not overthrow the fact that dramatic poetry among the Jews first proceeded from that "hybrid melting together of Judaism and Hellenism" which characterizes the Alexandrian Judaism. Comp. *Delitzsch*, zur Geschichte der jüd. Poesie, Leipzig 1836, p. 205 ff.—In very recent times, *Ed. R.* in the Hall. Allgemeine Litter. Zeitung, 1839, No. 191, p. 312; *Fr. Lücke*, Einl. in die Offenbarung Johannes, 2d ed. p. 389 ff.; the Reviewer of *Delitzsch's* Bearbeit. des Hohenliedes in the theol. Litteraturbl. zur Darmstadt. A. Kirchen Zeitung, 1851,

No. 144; and *E. Meyer*, Geschichte d. poet. National-Lit. d. Hebr. p. 478, have declared against admitting that there are dramatic poems in the Old Testament.

§ 108. *The Form of Hebrew Poetry.*

[*Bleek*, p. 81, names most of the writers mentioned before the commencement of § 107, and adds *Ed. Reuss*, Hebr. Poesie, in *Herzog's* Encycl.]

Since poetry is the expression of an animated state of mind, it is elevated above the ordinary tone and course of simple quiet diction, and avails itself of the language of excited feeling and strong emotion. This finds expression in perceptible changes of the voice, and in significant accentuation of the words; and it not only renders the diction more lively, pathetic, and overflowing (1), but also imparts to it a measured movement, advancing in harmonious rhythm, which corresponds to the changing moods of mind. This rhythm may be more the natural and immediate expression of the felt animation, or it may be more the product of refined art: it may be confined more to a rhythmical proportion in the thoughts, or it may advance till it reaches a proportion in the words and syllables, and so be fully developed into metre (2).

(1) Liveliness is imparted to poetical diction by the application of figures and comparisons, metaphors and tropes; of which *Lowth* treats at large in his Hebrew Poetry. Comp. also *Wenrich*, p. 105 sqq. It attains to fulness, loftiness, and euphony, by forming a *usus loquendi* which is distinguished from the ordinary prose diction by rare, unusual, and sonorous words, and by bold combinations and constructions. Comp. above, § 13, Note 5; *Häv.* Einl. iii. p. 26 ff.; and *Ewald*, poett. BB. i. p. 52 ff.

(2) "By a fundamental law in reference to voice, rhythm cannot remain entirely absent from any human language. Yet it stands out the more manifestly, the more that the waves of voice swell with the growing animation, and that the emotion increases in amount and vehemence; for in consequence it strives the more decidedly to give corresponding expression, and its risings and fallings stand more and more distinctly apart. This is most perfectly seen in poetry, where the soul, placed on the surging life as a foundation, and itself moved in corresponding moods, pours out its reflections in symmetrical series:

whether their symmetry be of purely internal formation, in the thoughts, like the Hebrew parallelism and the simpler popular poetry in general; or whether at the same time it assume an external shape in the individual sounds, like the poetry in measured syllables of the Greeks and other nations" (*Hupfeld*, in the theol. Stud. u. Krit. 1837, p. 869 f. Comp. *Ewald*, p. 57 f.).

Agreeably to the mental peculiarity of the Hebrew people, their poetry gives the preponderance to the thought over the form; and it has never attained to metrical rhythm, to measured syllables and rhyme, but has been contented with the rhythm of thought (3), which seeks and finds its formal expression in the fundamental law of all rhythmical movement,—namely, the law of *proportion in the clauses* and in the *series of the thoughts*, that is, the *parallelismus membrorum*, and the *structure in strophes*.

(3) In this respect Hebrew poetry has firmly kept true to its character of originality, and to its own nature, which is directed more towards the spiritual contents than towards the beauty of the external form. For "as the thoughts are the first and the ruling thing, the rhythm of the thoughts stands forth first of all, strongly creative and formative" (*Ewald*, p. 60). And "as the earnest nature of the Hebrews, retiring within itself, is directed to that which is inward—namely, the thoughts — their rhythm was more occupied with the thought than with the external form and sound" (*De Wette*, Comm. z. d. Psalmen, p. 46. Comp. *Häv.* Einl. p. 28).

I. The proportion in the *clauses* comes out principally in the *structure* or *rhythm of the verse;* that is, the linking, according to the rules of harmony, of the words presented by the language for expressing feelings, representations, and thoughts, into a well-rounded unity, which we name the *verse*. This is effected according to the law of the *parallelismus membrorum*, in such a way that the thought which flows forth from the internal emotion does not attain to exhaustive expression in one proposition, or one uninterrupted progressive series of words; but it divides itself into several corresponding and well-proportioned members, which stand in this mutual relation, that the discourse rises in one and sinks in another. In a *logical* point of view, this correspondence of the parallel members may consist in resemblance and equality, or in contrast, or, finally, in

a progress of thought; accordingly, there is a distinction made into *synonymous*, *antithetic*, and *synthetic* parallelism (4). In a *formal* respect, the members of the verse may present a *perfect* or an *imperfect* parallelism, according as they do or do not consist of a like number of words (5). Yet, even in this latter and more usual case, there is ordinarily a proportion preserved in their length, so that only occasionally a member is surprisingly shortened, for the sake of variety, and also for effect in the delineation (6). The length or shortness of the members is regulated by the contents and character of the poem and its individual parts; yet it seldom falls so low as three or four syllables, and equally seldom rises to twelve or fifteen: in this latter case these long members are divided into two, usually unequally, by a cæsura (7).

(4) See particulars as to this threefold form of parallelism in *Lowth*, de sacra poesi Hebr., ed. *Michaelis*, ii. p. 365 sq.

(5) Prov. x. 1:

בֵּן חָכָם יְשַׂמַּח־אָב
וּבֶן כְּסִיל תּוּגַת אִמּוֹ׃

Comp. Prov. x. 5, 7; Job xl. 25, 26, 28; Ps. xix. 8–10, xx. 9, etc.

(6) Job xiv. 4:

מִי־יִתֵּן טָהוֹר מִטָּמֵא
לֹא אֶחָד׃

Comp. Ps. xl. 10.

(7) It is in Job and in some parts of Proverbs that we most frequently meet with short and very equally balanced clauses; as, on the other hand, lengthened clauses with the cæsura predominate in Lamentations, and also in certain psalms, for instance Ps. xix. 8–14, Ps. cxxvi., and in Ps. cxxviii., yet here interchanging regularly with short clauses; comp. *J. G. Sommer*, bibl. Abhandlungen, vol. i. (Bonn 1846), p. 127.

1. The simplest, and therefore also the most frequent, form of rhythmical structure in a verse is the *distich*, when the verse consists of two clauses, whether their meaning be synonymous, antithetic, or synthetic (8). A *monostich*, or verse of one clause only, is very rare—only at the beginning, or in the middle, or between two strophes, or at the end of a poem (9).

(8) In the *synonymous* parallelism, the thought may be (*a*) simply repeated in other words,—for instance, Gen. iv. 23, Ps. ii. 1, xix. 2,

Prov. i. 32, ii. 11, Job iv. 17, v. 9; or (*b*) expressed positively and negatively, Ps. xvii. 5, xviii. 22, Job iv. 18, Prov. iv. 5, v. 8; or (*c*) analyzed, and expressed simply positively, Ps. xix. 3, Prov. iii. 10, 14, Job iii. 3, or at once positively and negatively, Prov. vi. 20, Ps. xxii. 3; or (*d*) the train of thought is so distributed that the one clause contains a thought more than the other, inasmuch as the first clause is only partially re-echoed in the second, Ps. lxviii. 33, Job xxxviii. 5, or it is more precisely defined and carried forward in the second, Ps. xxii. 3, Prov. i. 33.—In the *antithetical* parallelism, as a rule, the second clause contains the antithesis of the first, Prov. x. 1 ff., xv. 1, Ps. xviii. 28, xxii. 18; yet at times the thesis and the antithesis are distributed between the two clauses, Ps. xviii. 42, Prov. i. 24, 28, Isa. lxv. 13.—In the *synthetic* parallelism, the second clause may simply carry forward and complete the thought in the first, Ps. xxxi. 6, xix. 13, Prov. xx. 20; or may confirm it, Ps. xvi. 1, xxii. 12, Prov. xxi. 7; or may illustrate it by a comparison, Ps. xxii. 14, xlii. 2, ciii. 13, Job v. 26, Song ii. 2.

(9) A single clause can never form a verse which stands merely for its own sake: it can have a suitable position only along with other verses, for the sake of contrast with that which is usual. Most frequently it stands at the beginning of the poem, "where the strength of the emotion is as yet scarcely attempted to be put forth,"—for instance, Ps. xviii. 2, xxiii. 1, lxvi. 1, and often: seldom at the end, "where the emotion becomes exhausted and lost,"—for instance, Ex. xv. 18 (*Ewald*, poet. BB. i. p. 72 f.); or between two strophes,—for instance, Ps. xcii. 9: at times also with special emphasis in the middle of the poem, as when Ps. xxix. 7 imitates the suddenness and rapidity of the lightning, קוֹל־יְהוָה חֹצֵב לַהֲבוֹת אֵשׁ.

2. Verses of three or more clauses, *tristichs*, *tetrastichs*, *pentastichs*, are formed partly by the amplification of the clauses, partly by the combination of monostichs, distichs, and tristichs (10). In this process, the union of three distichs into one verse of six clauses forms the extreme limit of progress in the structure of verses which the poetical compositions exhibit (11).

(10) Verses of several clauses are more rarely formed by distributing the thought into three, four, or five synonymous or synthetic clauses. Examples of such tristichs with synonymous clauses are, Ps. vii. 6, xv. 3, xviii. 9, Prov. i. 22, 27, Job x. 17; with synthetical clauses, Ps. xxxi. 19, 22, lxi. 3. For tetrastichs of this kind, see Ps. v. 10, xxvii. 9, Eccles. xii. 3, 6, or Ps. xxxii. 6, xl. 18, Song ii. 7; for

pentastichs, Song iii. 4, 10, vii. 13, Prov. xxx. 4.—Much oftener, two synonymous or antithetical clauses stand in opposition to the third in a tristich; for instance, Ps. ii. 2, xv. 5, xviii. 14, or Job x. 1, Prov. xxxi. 15, or Ps. liv. 5, lxviii. 7, or Ps. xl. 7, lvii. 4, Job xv. 30.—The tetrastich most commonly consists of two distichs combined: these may be synonymous,—for instance, Ps. xliv. 3, lv. 22, or Ps. cxxvii. 1, xxxix. 2, xl. 15, 17; or antithetic, Ps. xxxi. 23, Job xxx. 1, Isa. liii. 4, xliii. 24, lii. 12; or synthetic, Prov. xxx. 17, Ps. xviii. 7, 16, Job vii. 21. More rarely they are formed out of a tristich and a monostich, as Ps. v. 11, xxxii. 5, xl. 11; or a distich and two monostichs, as Ps. xxxi. 20, lvii. 2, Prov. xxiv. 12. The pentastichs consist mostly of two distichs and a monostich; for instance, Ps. xi. 4, xxxix. 13, Song i. 6, vi. 9, viii. 5, Amos vi. 2, v. 13 [12?], 1 Sam. ii. 10, 2 Sam. xxiii. 5.

(11) Verses of six clauses, consisting of three distichs, are rare in lyric poetry,—for instance, Song iv. 8, 16, v. 1, 2. They are more frequent in the prophetical writings,—for instance, Num. xxiv. 17, Hab. iii. 16, 17; and in these there do occur verses of more than six clauses, since in general the oratorical rhythm has taken shape more freely than the lyrical.

II. The symmetry in the *series of the thoughts* is to be seen in the rhythmical structure of poems, or the structure of strophes; that is, in the symmetrical distribution and conjunction of the series of thoughts. These are so arranged, in dependence on the pauses in the discourse, and the turns in the development of the ideas, and in conformity to the laws of euphony and harmony, that a definite symmetry emerges in their consecution, and the groups of verses come to occupy a mutual relation analogous to that of the clauses in a single verse (12). This strophical structure, which may also be of a synonymous, an antithetic, or a synthetic kind, is most distinctly shown in those poems in which the strophes are marked off externally by similarity in the commencement or the conclusion, by refrains or recurring verses (13); yet it is also found in poems which are destitute of these external marks. It is completely regular, if not only the strophes have the same number of verses, but also the verses have the same number of clauses (14); yet, since the formal symmetry is subordinated to the substance of the thoughts in this structure of strophes more than in that of verses, for the most part it is not completely symmetrical, but the strophes exhibit variety in their length, and great diversity in the rhythmical organization (15).

(12) *F. B. Köster* was the first to call attention to this strophical structure of Hebrew poetry, in his discussion of "the strophes and the parallelism of Hebrew poetry," in the theol. Studien u. Krit. 1831, p. 40 ff., and in the discussions upon the strophical character of Job and Ecclesiastes, appended to his translation of these books. [*Bleek*, pp. 89–91, asserts that this tendency does exist in Hebrew poetry; but he thinks that *Köster* has carried it too far, as in these two translations. He praises the caution of *Ewald* in this respect.] Compare with this, *Ewald*, poett. BB. i. p. 92 ff., and über Liedwenden (Strophen) im B. Hiob, in the Jahrbb. für bibl. Wissenschaft, iii. p. 116 ff., viii. p. 69 ff. (in the Psalms), and *Wenrich*, p. 238 sqq.—*Hengstb.* die Psalmen, iv. p. 579, seeks for the principle of strophical arrangement in those "numbers which were reckoned in any respect sacred and significant by the Israelites—namely, 3, 4, 7, 10, 12." Yet, even if it were the fact that all strophes were formed upon these numbers (which is by no means the case), still the principle of strophical structure could never be contained in anything purely external, like this scheme of numbers. Compare my remarks in *Häv.* Einl. iii. p. 36 ff.

(13) In Ps. lxii. each strophe (vers. 2, 6, 10) begins with אַךְ; and the two first have similar verses at the commencement: comp. vers. 2 and 3 with vers. 6 and 7. Also in Ps. cxl. the commencement of the first two strophes is almost the same, vers. 2 and 5. More frequently there is a similarity in the conclusion, by means of a refrain, consisting of one line in a verse (Ps. xxxix. 6 and 12), or of a hemistich (Isa. ix. 11, 16, 20, x. 4), or of an entire recurring verse (Ps. xlii. 6, 12, xliii. 5, xlvi. 8 and 12, xlix. 13 and 21, lvii. 6 and 12, lxxx. 4, 8, (15), 20, xcix. 5 and 9), or of two verses (Ps. cvii. 8 and 9, 15 and 16, 21 and 22, 31 and 32). Comp. *Häv.* Einl. iii. p. 39.

(14) The strophes consist of two distichs in Ps. iii., xlvii., cxiv., cxxi.; of three distichs, Ps. xlvi., cxiii.; of three verses, Ps. xli., lxxxviii., xcvii.; of four verses, Ps. xii., lxi., lxii., lxxxiv. (marked by Selah), cxxix., cxxx.; of five verses, Ps. cxlvi. and xcix., Prov. viii. 12–31 and 32–36; of six verses, Ps. cxxxix.; of seven verses, Ps. cxlv.

(15) Poems with evenly proportioned strophical structure have often a shorter introduction and conclusion (Ps. iv., xv., xxxiii., lxxx.), or only a shorter introduction (Ps. lii., c., cxlix.), or only a shorter conclusion (Ps. xiv., xxiii., lxxix., xciii., xcvi., cxlviii.); or the length of the strophes is symmetrically *increased* (Ps. lxvii., ci., cxxii.) or *diminished* (Ps. xiii., cxxxviii., cxli.); or the strophes may be of various yet regularly changing lengths (Ps. cxviii., cxv., cxvi., and others).

Occasionally in one and the same psalm we see a combination of various forms of strophes and verses, corresponding to the subject-matter; for instance, in Ps. xix. and cxxvii. See this subject pursued further in *Häv.* Einl. iii. pp. 41–45.

III. A more artificial formation is presented by the *alphabetical* psalms, in which the verses—sometimes even the clauses—are designated by the letters of the alphabet, and so arranged according to these letters, that their number appears to determine the extent of the poem. This alphabetical structure, however, has remained confined to didactic songs and poems, whose subject-matter is expressed in separate sentences, such as do not admit of being rounded off and treated exhaustively by an internal development and an organically arranged distribution of the succession of ideas; the object being to stamp the character of a metrical composition upon the poetical representation, and to impress the symbol of completeness upon the subject-matter, when the treatment of the dominant idea has been pursued through the whole alphabet (16). It is no mere rhythmical artifice, nor a production of degenerated taste; nor, in general, did it first come into view in that later age in which poetical enthusiasm had disappeared (17). On the contrary, it was already applied by David to didactic poetry; in later times it was simply carried out further, and into more complicated forms (18).

(16) *Lowth, l.c.* p. 451 sq., has already said rightly: "*Acrostichidis* sive *alphabetici carminis* artificium . . . adhibebant Hebræi iis in locis, neque temere alias, in quibus sententiæ quædem, ipsa rerum et argumenti necessitudine non multum inter se connexæ, colligerentur." In his annotations on this passage in *Lowth*, *J. D. Michaelis* searched for an entirely external origin of this form of composition in the circumstance that certain Næniæ had to be learned by heart, and that this object was facilitated by the support thus given to the memory. In opposition to this, comp. *Hengstb.* Psalmen, ii. p. 93 ff., and *Häv.* Einl. p. 48.

(17) As is asserted by *De Wette*, Comm. z. d. Psalmen, p. 56; *Wenrich, l.c.* p. 244; and partly also *Ewald*, poett. BB. i. p. 139 f. In opposition to this, see *Sommer*, "On the Age of the Alphabetic Poems," in his bibl. Abhandlungen, i. p. 93 ff., and *Hengstb.* Psalmen, ii. p. 93, iv. pp. 583–4.

(18) The simplest kind, in which a single verse or a double verse,

a distich or a tetrastich, is assigned to every letter in the alphabet, is found only in the Davidic songs, Ps. xxv., xxxiv., cxlv., and Prov. xxxi. 10–31; and with double verses, Ps. ix. and x., xxxvii. More artificial is the structure in Lam. iv., where each alphabetical verse comprehends a long distich, divided by the cæsura into two halves; and Lam. i. and ii., where it comprehends three *stichoi*, divided by the cæsura. Lam. iii. is still more artificial; for here these three *stichoi* all begin with the same letter, each letter occurring in its proper order. Most artificial of all are Ps. cxi. and cxii., where each half verse is designated by a letter of the alphabet; and also Ps. cxix., which apportions eight distichs to each letter, so that each is repeated eight times uninterruptedly. This gradual progress in the art may be recognised also in the circumstance, that the alphabetical plan is carried out with thorough regularity in the latest songs of this kind; whereas, on the contrary, anomalies occur in the earlier ones, which in the Davidic songs are very important. These irregularities must not be charged upon the carelessness of the transcribers and the caprice of the collectors, as has been asserted by *Lud. Cappellus*, followed by various modern critics (*Eberh. Scheid*, in *Eichhorn*, allgemeine Bibliothek, ii. p. 944; *Bellermann*, Versuch ü. d. Metrik der Hebr. (Berlin 1813), p. 102 ff.; *Stuhlmann* on Ps. ix. and x., in *Keil* u. *Tzschirner's* Analekt. iii. 3, p. 1 ff.; and especially *Sommer*, von den Unregelmässigkeiten der alphab. Lieder, *ibid.* p. 138 ff.; partly also *Hitzig*, and *Ewald*, poett. BB. i. p. 144). In opposition to this, see *Hengstb.* Psalmen, iv. p. 583 ff., and my remarks in *Häv.* Einl. p. 50 ff.

IV. *Measured syllables*, or fixed and regular *metres*, and *rhyme*, always continued to be foreign to Old Testament poetry, and were first adopted from other nations in poetical art subsequent to canonical times, and in the new-Hebrew age (19). All attempts have failed to prove that there are fixed metres in Hebrew poetry, even when this has been sought to be accomplished at the expense of the correctness of the Masoretic pointing and accentuation (20). These attempts sprang out of the erroneous assumption that there could be no poetry without metre; whereas the ancient popular poetry of the Roman, German, and Romance nations had no metrical, but only rhythmical verses (21). Nor is *rhyme* essential to the form of ancient Hebrew poetry. Although it readily presented itself, owing to the peculiarity of the Hebrew suffixes, and therefore does repeatedly occur (for

instance, Gen. iv. 23; Ps. vi. 2, viii. 5; Job x. 10, 11, 17; Prov. xxii. 10, and elsewhere); still there is nowhere an effort made to seek for it, and in no poem is it regularly carried through. In fact, in a species of poetry in which the fundamental law is the parallelism of ideas, it neither could come to be fashionable, nor could it be reckoned among the essential requisites of perfection in form (22).

(19) So already the Rabbins (see the passages in *Carpzov*, Introd. ii. p. 4 sq.; *Bellermann*, Metrik, p. 245 ff.; *Delitzsch*, z. Geschichte der jüd. Poesie, p. 127); and among the Christians, *Jos. Scaliger*, *Rich. Simon*, *Wasmuth*, and others, in *Carpzov*, *l.c.*—The essence of the rhythmical principles in the Bible was more precisely developed by *Leutwein*, Versuch einer richt. Theorie v. d. bibl. Verskunst, Tübingen 1775; *Herder*, Briefe üb. d. Studium d. Theol. i. p. 151 ff. (in the year 1785), and Geist d. hebr. Poesie, i. p. 21 ff. (in the year 1787); *De Wette*, Comm. über die Psalmen, p. 39 ff.; *Gesenius* (in the introduction to the poetical part of his Hebrew Reading-book); and *Ewald*, poett. BB. i. p. 87 ff. Comp. *Delitzsch*, *ibid.* p. 129 f.

(20) [*Bleek's* view, p. 89, thoroughly coincides with this.] Following up various assertions, but without anything more precise in the way of proof, of *Josephus*, *Philo*, *Jerome*, *Eusebius*, and others (see *Carpzov*, p. 13, and *Saalschütz*, v. d. Form der hebr. Poesie, p. 9 ff.), several learned men have attempted to point out fixed metres. These have been said to be *Greek* metres, by *Francis Gomarus*, in his Davidis Lyra, s. nova Hebrææ scripturæ ars poet., Lugduni Batavorum 1637; by *Francis Hare*, in his Psalmorum liber (Hebr. et Lat.) in versiculos metricæ divisus, etc., Londini 1736, 2 vols.; by *Conr. Gottl. Anton*, in his Progr. Conjectura de metro Hebræorum antiquo, Lipsiæ 1770, and his Vindiciæ disput. de metro Hebr. 1771, and in other writings (comp. *Saalschütz*, p. 25 ff.). They have been said to be *Arabic* metres by *Sir William Jones*, in his Poeseos Asiatic. commentar., ed. *J. G. Eichhorn*, p. 61 sqq.; by *E. J. Greve*, in his Tractat. de metris Hebræorum, præsertim Jobæis, subjoined to his work, Ultima capp. libri Jobi, etc., 1788 f., and in several other writings (comp. *Saalschütz*, p. 37 ff.). They have been styled peculiar *Hebrew* metres by *Joach. Bellermann*, die Metrik der Hebr.; by *Saalschütz*, and by *Leop. Haupt*, sechs alt-testamentlichen Psalmen, mit ihren aus de Accenten entzifferten Singweisen, Leipzig 1854. On the other hand, others (*Michael Walther*, *Val. Löscher*, *Jac. Alting*, *Bartolòcci*, and more who are named in *Carpzov*, p. 21 sqq.; *Lowth*, *l.c.* p. 40 sq.; *Pfeiffer*, üb. die Musik der alten Hebr. p. xvi.; *Jahn*, bibl. Archäol. i. 1, § 100; *Meyer*, Hermeneutik des Alten Test. ii. p. 329) acquiesced in

the view that the Hebrew poetry may have had metres, but that these are irrecoverably lost to us.

(21) Comp. *Duentzer* et *Lor. Lersch*, de versu quem vocant Saturnio, Bonn 1838; also *Ferd. Wolf*, über die Lais, Sequenzen u. Leiche, Heidelberg 1841, pp. 14, 159 f.; also my remarks in *Häv.* Einl. iii. p. 69 ff.

(22) Comp. *Sommer*, upon rhyme in the popular poetry of the Hebrews, in his bibl. Abhandlungen, i. p. 85 ff.; with my remarks in *Häv.* Einl. iii. p. 73 ff. [*Bleek*, pp. 85, 86, thinks *Ewald* wrong in denying that there ever is intentional rhyme in Hebrew poetry. He selects three examples to the contrary—Gen. iv. 23, with ־י— four times; Job xvi. 12, with ־ני— twice; and Prov. xi. 3, with ־ם— twice: and he refers to *Sommer* for more instances, and for proofs that it was intentional even in the more ancient books. But he admits that it is not common, and that a much more frequent contrivance is parallelism, with an equal number of members, usually from six to eight syllables; referring especially to Job and Proverbs.]

THE PSALMS (תְּהִלִּים).

Commentaries:—Psalmorum libri v. ad Ebr. veritatem versi et familiari explanat. elucidati per *Aretium Felinum* (*Mart. Bucerum*), Argentorati 1526, fol.; 1529, 4to; and often. *M. Luther, Bugenhagen, Brentius, Selneccer, Tarnov. Musculus, J. Calvin, Marloratus, Coccejus;* see § 224. *M. Ant. Flaminii*, in libr. Pss. brevis explanatio, Venet. 1548; Recudi curavit *S. Th. Wald*, Halis 1785. *Fr. Vatabli*, Annotatt. in Pss. (in Bibl. *R. Stephani*, Parisiis 1557 f.) subjunctis *H. Grotii* notis, quibus observatt. adspersit *G. J. L. Vogel*, Halis 1767. Libri Psalmorum paraphras. Lat., etc. Addita sunt: argumenta singulorum Pss. et redduntur rationes paraphraseos, aspersis alicubi certorum locc. explanatiunculis. Excerpta omnia e scholis *Esromi Rudingeri*, libri iv., Gorl. 1581, 4to. *Anton. Agellii*, Comment. in Psalmos, Parisiis 1611 f. *Mos. Amyraldi*, paraphrasis in Pss. Davidis una cum annotatt. et argumentis, Salmurii 1662, 4to; cum præf. *Jac. Cremer*, Trajecti ad Rhenum 1769, 4to. *M. Geier, J. H. Michaelis* (annotatt. uberiores). *Venema, Rosenmüller, Maurer;* see § 224. *H. E. G. Paulus*, philol. Clavis üb. d. Pss., 2d ed., Heidelberg 1815. Comment. üb. d. Psalmen, v. *W. M. L. de Wette*, Heidelberg, 4th ed. 1836; 5th ed. issued by *G. Baur*, 1856. *G. Ph. Chr. Kaiser*, Zusammenhäng. histor. Erklärung der fünf Psalmen-Bücher als National-Gesangbuchs auf die Zeit von David bis zu

Simon d. Makkab., Nürnberg 1827. *L. Clauss*, Beiträge zur Kritik u. Exegese der Pss., Berlin 1831. *Rud. Stier*, Siebzig ausgew. Pss. nach Ordnung u. Zusammenhang ausgelegt, 2 vols., Halle 1834–35. *Ferd. Hitzig*, die Pss. histor. u. krit. Comment. u. Uebersetzung, 2 vols., Heidelberg 1835–36 [new edition, 1863–65]. *Ewald*, poet. BB. des Alten Test., vol. ii. 1835 [and newer editions, latest in 1866]. *E. W. Hengstenberg*, Comm. üb. die Psalmen, 4 vols., 2d ed., Berlin 1849–52. *A. Tholuck*, Uebersetzung u. Auslegung der Psalmen f. Geistliche u. Laien, Halle 1843. *Cäs. v. Lengerke*, die fünf BB. der Psalmen, Auslegung u. Verdeutschung, 2 vols., Königsberg 1847. *Dursch*, ein allgemeiner Commentar über die Pss. des Alten Test., 1842. *Just. Olshausen*, die Psalmen erklärt, Leipzig 1853 (Lieferung 14 of the kurzgefasst. exeg. Handbuchs). *Herm. Hupfeld*, die Psalmen übersetzt und ausgelegt, Gotha 1855, vol. i. [4 vols. 1855–62. *F. Delitzsch*, die Psalmen, 1859–60, 2 vols., new edition, 1867]. Translations by *J. A. Cramer* (poetical), with discussions, 4 vols., Leipzig 1763–4. *G. Ch. Knapp*, with remarks, Halle, 3d ed. 1789. *Herm. Muntinghe*, translated from the Dutch by *Scholl*, with remarks, 1792–3, 3 vols. *J. C. C. Nachtigal* (sung before David ascended the throne), Halle 1797. *Kuinöl*, with remarks, 1799. *M. H. Stuhlmann*, Hamburg 1812. *A. W. Krahmer* (metrical), with exposition, 2 vols., Leipzig 1837. *F. B. Köster*, Königsberg 1837. *J. G. Vaihinger*, rhythmical translation, with remarks, Stuttgart 1845. *E. Meier*, Stuttgart 1850.

For Introduction:—*Fr. Delitzsch*, Symbolæ ad Pss. illustrandos isagogicæ, Lipsiæ 1846.

§ 109. *Titles.*

The common title of all the Psalms in the Hebrew text is תְּהִלִּים [a plural which is not elsewhere in use, as Bleek remarks, p. 611], *songs of praise*, that is, in praise of God (1); and that of the Davidic Psalms is תְּפִלּוֹת, *prayers*, Ps. lxxii. 20 (2). Both designations were originally applied, in a narrower sense, to single psalms: the former in Ps. cxlv. 1, of a song in which the praise of God forms its prominent characteristic and its exclusive subject-matter; the latter, a prayer, or a *song of supplication*, in Ps. xvii., lxxxvi., xc., cii., cxlii. Besides, in the superscriptions, various psalms are designated by מִכְתָּם, *a song of deeper, hidden sense* (Ps. xvi., lvi.–lx.) (3); מַשְׂכִּיל, *instruction*, a didactic song (Ps. xxxii., xlii., xliv., xlv., lii.–lv., lxxiv., lxxviii.,

lxxxviii., lxxxix., cxlii.) (4); מִזְמוֹר, *psalm of praise* (Ps. iii., iv., etc.) (5); שִׁיר, *song*, combined with either Mizmor (Ps. xlviii., lxvi., etc.) or other additional words, to mark more precisely the destination of the song (6); and שִׁגָּיוֹן, *poem of wild excitement*, dithyramb (Ps. vii.) (7).

(1) Hence the Psalter is named by the Rabbins סֵפֶר תְּהִלִּים, ס׳ תְּלִים (or תְּלִין); and by *Jerome*, liber hymnorum.

(2) Both of these titles, selected *à potiori*, are quite suitable, in so far as, on the one hand, all plaintive and supplicatory psalms tend to the praise and glory of God; and, on the other hand, all praising and didactic psalms contain an element of supplication. Comp. *F. L. Stolberg*, Geschichte der Religion Jesu, vol. iii. p. 457; and *Hengstb.* Psalmen, iv. pp. 533–4.

(3) Comp. *Hengstb.* on Ps. xvi. 1. The very prevalent explanation of מִכְתָּם, as if equivalent to מִכְתָּב (Isa. xxxviii. 9), "scriptum = carmen," approaches too nearly to saying nothing; and it cannot be justified philologically, since in the Shemitic dialects the roots כתם and כתב are strongly distinguished. [Another more plausible interpretation is that given in the margin of the English version, *a golden psalm*, or a *jewel; Hupfeld* seems undecided between this and *an inscription*, the rendering of the Septuagint and the Vulgate.]

(4) This interpretation is made certain by אַשְׁכִּיל (Ps. xxxii. 8) and מַשְׂכִּיל (Ps. xlvii. 8). Nor is it refuted by the objection that all of the psalms with this superscription have not the didactic character: for every expression of holy feeling serves for instruction in righteousness, and in psalms which have sprung from some individual occasion the singers set forth their feelings for the congregation; and also, there is no mistaking the hortatory character of the most of the psalms which bear this superscription. Comp. *Hengstenberg's* introduction to Ps. xxxii., and *Häv.* Einl. iii. p. 85 f. [Nor has any other interpretation been proposed which has obtained anything like tolerable assent; unless possibly that of Gesenius be preferred, who modifies the meaning of making wise into *making pious*.]

(5) מִזְמוֹר is found fifty-seven times in these superscriptions of the psalms, and nowhere else: it is derived from זָמַר, *to resound*, and זָמַר, *to sing to the praise of God* (Judg. v. 3), usually to sing praise with the accompaniment of the guitar or harp; and it designates the *song of praise* in honour of God (as distinguished from נְגִינָה, the *playing*, the song as played on the stringed instrument, without reference to its subject-matter, commonly a worldly song, Ps. lxix. 13, Job xxx. 9, Lam. iii. 14). And so it corresponds to the Greek ψαλμός,

from ψάλλειν, to strike the strings, to make them sound, to play upon a stringed instrument. Both זָמַר and מִזְמוֹר have ever been confined to singing praise to God, in the *usus loquendi* of sacred poetry; and the noun is sometimes combined with שִׁיר, in order to give more prominence to the idea of *singing* (Ps. xlviii. 1, lxvi. 1, lxvii. 1, lxviii. 1, lxxxiii. 1, lxxxviii. 1, cviii. 1), or with לְתוֹדָה, to give the like prominence to *praise* (Ps. c. 1). Besides, the instrument is frequently mentioned on which the accompaniment is played, Ps. xxxiii. 2, lxxi. 22, xcviii. 5, cxlix. 3. As to the etymology of זמר, comp. *E. Meier*, hebr. Wurzelwörterbuch, p. 209 ff., and my remarks in *Häv.* Einl. p. 86 ff.

(6) Such is the song of the dedication of the house of God [though taken by some good authorities to be, of David's palace], Ps. xxx. 1; the song of the loved ones, the brides [though by many understood to be a song of lovely things, or a love-song], Ps. xlv. 1; a song on Alamoth, after the manner of virgins, Ps. xlvi. 1, comp. 1 Chron. xv. 20; a song for the Sabbath-day, Ps. xcii. 1; and [a song of degrees, as in the Eng. version, but better] *song of the pilgrimages*, שִׁיר הַמַּעֲלוֹת, Ps. cxx., cxxii.–cxxxiv., and שִׁיר לַמַּעֲלוֹת, Ps. cxxi., appointed to be sung on the journeys to the feasts, not a *song of the steps*, nor a song of the upper choir. Comp. *Häv.* Einl. p. 91 ff.

(7) Comp. *Clauss*, Beitrr. p. 116 ff.; *Ewald*, poett. BB. i. p. 28; *Delitzsch*, Habakuk, p. 126 f.; *Häv.* Einl. p. 95. Untenable explanations are, *lamentation*, hymn, or *aberration* = song of aberration.

§ 110. *Contents and Divisions.*

The Psalms, as the productions of sacred lyrical poets, employed in composing for the worship of God and the edification of the community, cover the entire field of Old Testament revelation, in its dogmatic, ethical, and historico-theocratic subject-matter. They do not make any essentially new disclosures as to God's being, and His government upon earth and in the theocracy. Yet they do contain, in the form of testimonies from men who partook most eminently of the theocratic spirit, an overflowing fulness of experimental knowledge and instruction—obtained from living under the revealed law, and by means of the struggle of the spirit against the flesh—on the subjects of the providence of God and His administration of the world, the nature of the human heart and its conduct towards God and His word, and

the blessings of theocratic fellowship with God, together with its means of grace and salvation. And thus they do not indeed present any objective advance in religious knowledge, when compared with the teaching of the Pentateuch; and yet there is certainly a subjective advance in the more spiritual apprehension, from all sides, of the law, with its commands and promises, its prohibitions and threatenings. And this is made especially manifest in the further unfolding of the Messianic prophecies (1).

(1) Comp. *Oehler*, Prolegomena zur Theologie d. Alten Test., Stuttgart 1845, p. 88 f., and *Häv.* Einl. iii. p. 95 ff. In reference to the teaching in the Psalms as to faith and morals, comp. *J. A. Cramer*, poet. Uebersetzung der Pss. ii. p. 195 ff.; *Tholuck*, die Psalmen, Einl. § 4; *Hengstb.* Psalmen, iv. p. 611 ff.—The Messianic psalms contain "subjective testimonies by the prophetic Spirit, coming through the medium of the spiritual life of distinguished theocratic men: since the holy singers, especially David, either under the impulse by the Divine Spirit who animated them, make the contents of the covenant-promise (particularly the promise opened up to David by the prophet Nathan, 2 Sam. vii. 12–16) the object of their believing contemplation, ponder these contents in their depth and many-sided relations, and set them forth in their more definite essential points (*prophetico-messianic*, Ps. ii., lxxii., cx., xlv.); or else, being laid hold of by the Spirit of God in their individual experience, they give expression to their situation, their feelings, and their hopes, in such a way that their discourse more or less unconsciously delineates the future personality of the Redeemer (*typico-messianic*, Ps. xvi., xxii., xl., lxix., and others)." *Häv.* Einl. iii. p. 101 ff. Comp. *Sack*, christl. Apologetik, pp. 278, 280 of the 2d ed.; and *Hengstb.* Psalmen, iv. p. 647 ff.

The collection of these songs for worship, 150 in number (2), is divided into *five* books, after the pattern of the law of Moses [so *Bleek*, p. 612, following *Epiphanius*, de mens. et pond. c. 5], which are separated by their concluding doxologies. Book first includes Ps. i.–xli.; book second, Ps. xlii.–lxxii.; book third, Ps. lxxii.–lxxxix.; book fourth, Ps. xc.–cvi.; book fifth, Ps. cvii.–cl.—On account of the great variety of moods and feelings, and the frequent and rapid changes of these, it is impossible to classify the Psalms strictly, according to either form or matter (3). Yet they may, in general, be

ranged in *three* classes:—1. Psalms of *praise and thanksgiving*; for instance, Ps. viii., xviii., xix., xxiii., xxix., etc. 2. Psalms of *lamentation*, or penitential and supplicatory songs; for instance, Ps. iii.–vi., etc. 3. *Didactic* psalms; Ps. i., xiv., xv., xxxii., xxxvii., etc. (4).

(2) Here is a table of deviations in the numbering and division of the psalms in the Hebrew Canon, and in the Septuagint and Vulgate:—

Hebrew Text.	Septuagint and Vulgate.
Ps. ix. and x.,	Ps. ix.
Ps. xi.–cxiii.,	Ps. x.–cxii.
Ps. cxiv. and cxv.,	Ps. cxiii.
Ps. cxvi.,	Ps. cxiv. and cxv.
Ps. cxvii.–cxlvi.,	Ps. cxvi.–cxlv.
Ps. cxlvii.,	Ps. cxlvi. and cxlvii.
Ps. cxlviii.–cl.,	Ps. cxlviii.–cl.
	Ps. cli., apocryphal.

Ps. xlii. and xliii. are combined into one psalm by many recent critics —*Ewald*, *v. Lengerke*, *Olshausen*, [*Bleek*], *Sommer*, bibl. Abhandlungen, pp. 177–8, and others, following thirty-seven manuscripts of *Kennicott* and *De Rossi*: and so also Ps. ix. and x. by *Anton*, Carmen alphab. integrum Ps. ix. et x. conjunct. restituit, Witebergæ 1805; *Bellermann*, Metrik. p. 140 f.; *Eb. Scheid* and *Stuhlmann* (see § 108, Note 18); *Sommer*, p. 153 ff. [*Bleek*, p. 627, is inclined to think the Septuagint is right in this solitary instance. He is also disposed to join Ps. cxiii. and cxiv., and again Ps. cxvii. and cxviii.] But their internal connection leads to nothing more than identity of authorship and simultaneousness of composition; while against combining them there are these reasons—that the manuscripts have separated them, certainly not accidentally; and that the contents of each individual psalm are complete, and well rounded off. Comp. *Hengstb.* Pss. i. p. 206; also *Hupfeld* and *Baur* on Ps. ix.—It is quite arbitrary in *De Wette*, *Köster*, *Ewald*, *Sommer* (p. 61 ff.), *Olshausen*, and *Hupfeld*, to separate Ps. xix. into two songs; and still worse is the dismemberment of Ps. xxiv. by *Ewald*, *Olshausen*, and *Sommer*. [To this *Bleek*, p. 627, is inclined; and he has the same inclination to divide Ps. xxvii. and xxxii.] Against them, see my remarks in *Häv.* Einl. iii. pp. 172 and 177.

(3) The division into hymns and odes, songs, elegies, and didactic poems (*Augusti*), and that into hymns to God, national hymns, psalms of Zion and of the temple, psalms of the king, psalms of supplication and lamentation, religious songs, and didactic poems (*De Wette*), rest

upon inappropriate æsthetic principles, and partly also upon very doubtful exposition.

(4) There is a very similar division in *Hengstb.* Pss. iv. pp. 544–5: —1. Psalms proceeding from predominantly joyful emotional moods. 2. Those from moods predominantly sad and depressed. 3. Those from a more calm and contemplative mood—psalms of religious morality, or didactic psalms. Comp. also *Baur* on *De Wette*, Pss. p. 69 ff.

§ 111. *Superscriptions, and Notes appended.*

All the psalms except thirty-four (1) have longer or shorter *superscriptions* (Ɛ). These contain either merely the characteristic designation of the song, with or without the author's name, or only the author's name (3); or else, at the same time, notices of a musical and liturgical nature, the explanation of which is still in part very much a matter of controversy (4).

(1) Namely, Ps. i., ii., x., xxxiii., xliii., lxxi., xci., xciii.–xcvii., xcix., civ.–cvii., cxi.–cxix., cxxxv.–cxxxvii., cxlvi.–cl. In the Talmud these are named מזמוריא יתומיא, the *orphan psalms*.

(2) Comp. *Chr. Sonntag*, ראשי תלין, h. e. tituli psalmorum, etc., Silus. 1687, 4to. *Ol. Celsius*, de titulis Pss., Holm. 1718, 4to. *Guil. Irhov.*, Conjectan. in Pss. titulos, Lugduni Batavorum 1728, 4to. *Calmet*, bibl. Unterss. vi. 259 ff. *H. Phil. Rée*, Forschungen über die Ueberschriften der Pss., Leipzig 1846.

(3) Namely, (*a*) מִזְמוֹר, Ps. xcviii.; מִזְמוֹר לְתוֹדָה, Ps. c.; or with a statement of the purpose to which the psalm was to be applied, מ׳ שִׁיר לְיוֹם הַשַּׁבָּת, Ps. xcii.; שִׁיר הַמַּעֲלוֹת, Ps. cxx., cxxiii., cxxv., cxxvi., cxxviii.–cxxx., cxxxii., cxxxiv.; and ש׳ לַמ׳, Ps. cxxi. (*b*) Simply the statement of the author's name, לְדָוִד, Ps. xxv.–xxviii., xxxv., xxxvii., ciii., cxxxviii., cxliv.; and לִשְׁלֹמֹה, Ps. lxxii. (*c*) The author's name, with the historical occasion, Ps. xxxiv. (*d*) The author's name, and an appellation for the psalm: (*α*) מִזְמוֹר לְדָוִד, Ps. xv., xxiii., xxix., cxli., cxliii.; (*β*) לְדָוִד מִזְמוֹר, Ps. xxiv., ci., cx.; (*δ*) מ׳ לְאָסָף, Ps. l., lxxiii., lxxix., lxxxii.; (*ε*) מ׳ לְדָוִד לְהַזְכִּיר, Ps. xxxviii.; (*ζ*) מִכְתָּם לְדָוִד, Ps. xvi.; (*η*) תְּפִלָּה לְדָוִד, Ps. xvii., lxxxvi., and תפ׳ לְמֹשֶׁה אִישׁ הָאֱלֹהִים, Ps. xc.; (*θ*) תְּהִלָּה לְדָוִד, Ps. cxlv., and לְדָוִד מַשְׂכִּיל, Ps. xxxii.; (*ι*) מַשְׂכִּיל לְאָסָף, Ps. lxxiv., lxxviii., and לְאֵיתָן הָאֶזְרָחִי מ׳, Ps. lxxxix.; (*κ*) שִׁיר מִזְמוֹר לְדָוִד, Ps. cviii., or שִׁיר מ׳ לְאָסָף, Ps. lxxxiii., and לִבְנֵי קֹרַח ש׳ מ׳, Ps. xlviii.; (*λ*) לִבְנֵי ק׳ מ׳ ש׳, Ps. lxxxvii.; (*μ*) שִׁיר הַמַּעֲלוֹת לְדָוִד, Ps. cxxii., cxxiv.,

cxxxi., cxxxiii., and שׁ' המ' לִשְׁלֹמֹה, Ps. cxxvii.; (ν) מִזְמוֹר שִׁיר חֲנֻכַּת הַבַּיִת לְדָוִד, Ps. xxx.

(4) These consist (*a*) of the simple לַמְנַצֵּחַ *before* the designation of the psalm (Ps. lxvi.), or the name of the author (xi., xiii., xiv., xix.–xxi., xxxi., xxxvi., xl.–xlii., xliv., xlvi., xlvii., xlix., lxiv., lxv., lxviii., lxx., lxxxv., cix., cxxxix., cxl.), and the historical notices (Ps. xviii., li., lii.); (*b*) of various notices, belonging to למנצח, which precede the designations of the psalms, and the statements as to their authors, their occasions, and their objects, and which are separated from it by occupying this position.—That these notices are pieces of technical information about the music, and not concealed emblematic designations of the subject-matter (as *Hengstb.* and others think), and are connected with the sacred playing which accompanied the singing of psalms in public worship, is inferred with certainty from the following circumstances:—(*a*) The musical signification of some of them—for instance, בִּנְגִינוֹת or עַל נְגִינַת—is not a matter of doubt, but is universally acknowledged; (*b*) Not a single superscription without למנצח presents a concealed emblematic designation of the subject-matter; (*c*) The words of uncertain meaning are found only in superscriptions beginning with למנצח, and in fact always belong to this term, so that the remaining statements in the superscription constitute a second and independent part of it.—This term למנצח in fifty-five superscriptions is a *Piel* participle, "presiding over the temple music, directing the playing at worship:" it is as much as to say, ["to be delivered] to the chief musician." The addition בנגינות (Ps. iv., liv., lv., lxvii., and lxxvi.) means, "with an accompaniment played upon stringed instruments" (not "with stringed instruments" themselves); for נגינה is the *playing* on stringed instruments, and the plural is to be taken in an intensive meaning. עַל נְגִינַת (Ps. lxi.) is, "upon the playing of stringed instruments," and עַל שְׁמִינִית (Ps. xii. [also Ps. vi. along with בִּנְגִינוֹת]), "according to, upon the octave," comp. 1 Chron. xv. 21 (not "upon the octachord"); עַל הַגִּתִּית, "according to the style of Gath" (Ps. viii., lxxxi., lxxxiv.); לִידוּתוּן (Ps. xxxix.), ["to be delivered] to Jeduthun," a chief musician along with Asaph and Heman under David (1 Chron. xvi. 41, 42, xxv. 1, 3, and often); and לַמְנַצֵּחַ עַל יְדוּתוּן (Ps. lxii., lxxvii.), "to the chief musician over Jeduthun," that is, over Jeduthun's choir of singers. The other statements are quite a riddle to us, on account of our entire ignorance of the Hebrew music and method of singing:—עַל מַחֲלַת (Ps. liii.), "upon sickness;" עַל מָחֲלַת לְעַנּוֹת (Ps. lxxxviii.), "upon the sickness, concerning the assault or temptation [humiliation];" אֶל הַנְּחִילוֹת (Ps. v.), "with reference to the inheritance;" עַל מוּת לַבֵּן, "about dying, to (or for) the son;" עַל אַיֶּלֶת

הַשַּׁחַר (Ps. xxii.), "about (or after) the hind of the dawn;" עַל יוֹנַת אֵלֶם רְחֹקִים (Ps. lvi.), "about (or after) the dumb dove of those who are far off;" עַל שׁוֹשַׁנִּים (Ps. xlv., lxix.), "about (or after) lilies;" עַל שׁוֹשַׁן עֵדוּת (Ps. lx., comp. lxxx. [אֶל שׁוֹשַׁנִּים עֵדוּת]), "about (or after) the lily of the testimony;" אַל תַּשְׁחֵת, "destroy not!" (Ps. lvii.–lix. [lxxv.]). But they are obviously compendious designations of songs, to the key or the melody of which—perhaps also its musical accompaniment—the psalm was to be set in the worship of God. See the proof of this in *Häv.* Einl. iii. p. 111 ff.

Appended Notes are such as the word which occurs seventy-one times (5) in thirty-nine psalms, besides thrice in Hab. iii., and which has been most variously interpreted (6)—סלה, *Selah*, in the Septuagint *διάψαλμα*, perhaps "interlude:" it probably served to mark where the blowing of trumpets by the ministering priests—a symbolical representation of their urgently calling upon Jehovah—was to come in to the psalm-singing and the playing on stringed instruments by the Levites (7). Such are also הִגָּיוֹן, *Higgaion*, Ps. ix. 17, probably = "piano" (8); and the words appended to a few titles—לְהַזְכִּיר (Ps. xxxviii., lxx.), "to remind," and לְלַמֵּד (Ps. lx.), "to teach."

(5) See the table of the passages in *Jul. Fürst's* Concordance, under this word; and comp. *Häv.* Einl. iii. p. 120, note. [Also *Delitzsch* and *Hupfeld* in their Commentaries, on the subject of this and Notes 6 and 7.]

(6) See the most important explanations in *Gesenii* Thesaurus, under this word, and in *Sommer's* bibl. Abhandll. i. p. 1 ff.

(7) See the proof of this explanation at large in *Sommer, ibid.;* and comp. *my* remarks in *Häv.* Einl. p. 123 ff.

(8) The explanation "tumultuous, loud playing" (*Gesenius, De Wette*), is unfounded; comp. *Häv.* p. 128.

The superscriptions have not been attached for the first time by the collectors of the Psalms, following vague and uncertain conjectures, but they have proceeded from the authors themselves (9). In favour of their genuineness, there are (*a*) the practice of the Hebrew and Arabian poets to prefix their names to their songs (10); (*b*) the fact that the Psalms are not all provided with superscriptions, and that these superscriptions present the greatest variety of form and matter, and even of length and brevity (11); (*c*) the subject-matter of them.

For those notices which relate to the musical execution had already become unintelligible in the age succeeding the exile; and they are found in none of the psalms of manifestly later date, but only in those of David and his singers (12). And the rest of the notices, concerning the character of the psalm, its author, its historical occasion, or its primary object, have these two proofs of their genuineness and originality: On the one hand, they are often confirmed by the historical books, and yet they have not been drawn from these sources by mere conjectures (13): on the other hand, they coincide perfectly with the contents of the Psalms; they contain not a single statement which can be shown to be untrue; and they have been proclaimed to be incorrect and unsuitable only on account of erroneous dogmatic, æsthetic, and critical prejudices (14).

(9) In all antiquity no one doubted of their genuineness, except *Theodore* of Mopsuestia, according to a notice in *Leontius Byzantinus*, c. Nestor. et Eutych., l. iii. c. 15. The recent critics were the first to tread in his footsteps: *Vogel*, Dissert. inscriptiones Pss. serius demum additas videri, Halis 1767; *Eichhorn*, *Bertholdt*, *De Wette*, *Hitzig*, *Ewald*, *v. Lengerke*, *Olshausen*, *Hupfeld*, and others. [*Bleek*, pp. 613–615, is of their opinion, though he applies it very cautiously: he thinks it impossible that the superscription to Ps. lix., cxxii., and cxliv. can be correct; but he defends those of Ps. vii. and lx.] On the contrary, their genuineness is defended with energy by *Clauss*, Beitrr. p. 32 f.; by *Tholuck* and *Hengstb.* in their Commentaries; by *Delitzsch*, in his Symbolæ; and by the author of this manual, in *Häv.* Einl. p. 130 ff.

(10) Testimony is borne to this custom by the superscriptions, 2 Sam. xxiii. 1 (whose genuineness is acknowledged even by *Hitzig*, Ps. ii. p. 1), Isa. xxxviii. 9, and 2 Sam. xxii. 1 compared with Ps. xviii. 1. Comp. *Häv.* Einl. p. 131.

(11) Had the later collectors been the first to attach the superscriptions, proceeding on conjectural grounds, they would not only have provided them for many psalms which now have none, though their contents suggest easy conjectures; but also, they would have made them in general less disproportionate in length. Comp. *Häv.* pp. 132–3.

(12) This not only excludes the idea that this portion of the superscriptions originated after the exile; it also refutes *Ewald's* assertion, that mere conjecture gradually forced its way more and more into this territory, while the genuine historical recollection of these times of high antiquity was being continually lost more and more. Comp. *Häv.* p. 134 ff.

(13) For instance, the historical statement, Ps. lx. 2, receives light and confirmation from 2 Sam. viii. 3 ff., 1 Chron. xviii. 3 ff.; yet at the same time it shows that it is independent of these historical accounts, because it gives the number of Edomites as 12,000 instead of 18,000 (in Sam. and Chron.), and mentions the victory over Aram-Naharaim as well as over Aram-Zobah, [and attributes the slaughter of these Edomites to Joab, who was commander-in-chief, whereas in Chronicles it is ascribed, with more minuteness of detail, to Abishai, and with less minuteness in Samuel, to David]: comp. *Hengstb.* Ps. iii. p. 127 ff.; *Häv.* Einl. iii. p. 140 f.—Further, in psalms which unmistakeably owe their origin to historical events (Ps. xlvi., xlviii., lxxxvii., etc.), or which present rich material for historical conjectures (Ps. xx., xliii., lxi., etc.), statements of this kind are wholly wanting; whereas they do occur in others whose contents furnish no occasion for them (Ps. xxxiv., liv., lvii., lx., etc.). Consequently the verbal agreement of individual titles with the accounts in our historical books (Ps. xxxiv. 1 with 1 Sam. xxi. 14, Ps. liv. 2 with 1 Sam. xxiii. 19) are explained only by a dependence of the historical narratives upon the psalms, and not *vice versa*.

(14) See the special evidence in *Hengstb.*'s Commentary; which is not deprived of its force by the counter-remarks of *Olshausen*, *Hupfeld*, and others. The common objections to the originality and genuineness of the superscriptions—*Ewald's*, for instance—are transformed into the very contrary if we weigh them more exactly. The observation that, besides David, Moses, Solomon, Asaph, Heman, and Ethan [and the sons of Korah], no poet is mentioned by name out of the many other times and centuries, is confirmed by the historical books naming no other psalmist; and the fact is to be explained thus, that the royal singer David, with his attendant followers, was recognised in Israel unconditionally as master of the sacred song, so that no other name could be brought forward alongside of his and those of his masters in song. The assertion that the second and third books of the Psalms present more superscriptions than the first does, and that these are richer in their compass, contains no proof of the gradually and continually increasing inroads of conjecture into this territory; for this plain reason, that the later books, the fourth and fifth, contain extremely few superscriptions, and these mostly very short. The explanation of their actual relations is to be found in the principle on which the collection was made; see § 114. And it is useless to appeal to the deviations in the titles of the Alexandrian and the Syrian versions; for these deviations wear upon their forehead the stamp of their arbitrary origin. Comp. *Häv.* p. 144 ff.

§ 112. *Authors of the Psalms.*

The names of the following *authors* are mentioned in the titles:—

I. *Moses*, the man of God, author of Ps. xc., whose language and contents are proof of its high antiquity (1).

II. *David*, author of seventy-three psalms (iii.–ix., xi.–xxxii., xxxiv.–xli., li.–lxv., lxviii.–lxx., lxxxvi., ci., ciii., cviii.–cx., cxxii., cxxiv., cxxxi., cxxxiii., cxxxviii.–cxlv.). This wealth in songs is to be explained by the rich poetical endowments of the royal singer, by the manifold fortunes of his life, and by the attitude of his heart towards the Lord and His sanctuary. His songs are distinguished by the manifold variety of their objects, situations, and styles; by great depth and liveliness of emotion; by bold, heroic faith; by forcible and occasionally difficult diction, and by lofty flights of poetry: while the common didactic psalms move more in easy and ordinarily comprehensible forms (2).

III. *Solomon*, author of Ps. lxxii. and cxxvii.: the contents of both justify their claim to be written by him (3).

IV. *Asaph*, son of Berechiah, a Levite, and a chief musician of David, and a celebrated psalmist (1 Chron. vi. 24, xv. 17, 19, xvi. 5, 37; 2 Chron. xxix. 30; Neh. xii. 46), author of twelve psalms; of which, however, only seven (namely, Ps. l., lxxiii., lxxvii., lxxviii., lxxx.–lxxxii.) belong to this elder Asaph. The remaining five have their origin in later times: Ps. lxxxiii., in the times of Jehoshaphat; Ps. lxxv. and lxxvi., in the Assyrian period, under Hezekiah; Ps. lxxiv. and lxxix., in the beginning of the Chaldean period. These, however, bear the name of Asaph, because they proceeded from members of Asaph's family of singers, one or other of whom perhaps even bore the name of his renowned ancestor. The older Asaph is distinguished for didactic poetry (4).

V. The *sons of Korah*, or *Korahites* [in the Eng. ver. *Korhites*], a celebrated race of singers, descended from the Levite Korah (Ex. vi. 21, 24; Num. xvi. 1, 35, xxvi. 11), whose head in David's times was *Heman* (1 Chron. vi. 16 ff., xv. 19), and which still had a charge of the songs of the temple under Jehoshaphat (2 Chron. xx. 19). To them are attributed eleven psalms (xlii., xliv.–xlix.,

lxxxiv., lxxxv., lxxxvii., lxxxviii.: of which Ps. xlii., xliv., and lxxxiv. belong to the age of David; Ps. xlv. to that of Solomon; Ps. xlviii., and probably enough Ps. xlvii. also, to that of Jehoshaphat; and Ps. xlvi. and lxxxvii. to that of Hezekiah. But Ps. xlix. and lxxxv. are destitute of historical references. Finally, Ps. lxxxviii. is by the chief musician of the singing choir of the sons of Korah [in David's time], *Heman* the Ezrahite, that is, of the race of Zerah the son of Judah, with whose family this Levite was civilly incorporated (5).

VI. *Ethan* the Ezrahite, the same person as *Jeduthun*, a chief musician of David (1 Chron. vi. 29 ff., xvi. 41, 42, xxv. 1, 3, compared with xv. 17, 19, 1 Kings v. 11, and 2 Chron. xxxv. 15), the author of Ps. lxxxix., the subject of which is the condition of the anointed of Jehovah during the conspiracy of Absalom (6).

(1) The superscription seems, indeed, not to be from Moses' own hand, on account of the designation given to him, "the man of God," which does not occur in the books of Moses; but it comes from a good old source, probably from the same hand that appended the blessing of Moses "the man of God" (Deut. xxxiii. 1) to the law which Moses had composed. [*Bleek*, p. 615, says the antiquity of the psalm is undoubted, and that there are no sufficient reasons for denying that Moses is the author.]

(2) Comp. *Tholuck*, Pss. p. xlii., and *Hengstb.* Pss. iv. p. 559 f. On the contrary, modern criticism has gone so far astray, that it has not only denied that David is the author of many of these psalms (*Rosenmüller*, *De Wette*, *Hitzig*, *Ewald*, *Vaihinger*, and others); but [of course only in its extreme representatives] it has even maintained with all earnestness, that we cannot safely affirm that so much as one of them is to be traced back to the age of David and Solomon (*Vatke*, bibl. Theol. i. p. 292), and in general that David was no religious poet (*von Lengerke*, Pss. p. xxvi. f.)! The objections to David's authorship, taken from the contents, spirit, and form of individual psalms, are removed by *Hengstb.* as he comments upon these several psalms, and by *Häv.* Einl. p. 156 ff.

(3) Comp. *Häv.* Einl. pp. 247–8.

(4) See the proof of these particulars in *Häv.* Einl. p. 213 ff., [and in *Delitzsch*, Psalmen, pp. 343–4, 2d ed., where, however, he now leans more to a Maccabean date for Ps. lxxiv. and lxxix. *Bleek's* view, p. 616, is similar in essentials: he thinks there may have been collections of psalms by the family of Asaph, and by the sons of Korah].

(5) Comp. *Hengstb.* Pss. iii. p. 490 f., and *Häv.* Einl. p. 230 ff.

(6) See the justification of this superscription in *Häv.* Einl. p. 243 ff. [It is also maintained by *Delitzsch*, who thinks the occasion of its composition may have been the invasion of Judah by Shishak.]

[There is a certain confirmation of the truthfulness of the superscriptions which attribute so many psalms to David's three singers and their choirs, and to no others (as already noticed, § 111, Note 14), in the completeness of the arrangements for the temple service in the time of David and Solomon, as related at length in 1st Chronicles. One instance of that completeness is the arrangement of these choirs in connection with the Levitical genealogies, carefully given especially in ch. vi., from which it appears that the three chief musicians belonged respectively to the three families of Levi's sons; namely, Asaph to the Gershonites, Heman to the Kohathites, and Ethan to the Merarites.—On the other hand, we have no historical information which confirms the supposition of *Bleek*, pp. 627–630, that the Psalms underwent considerable changes in the course of being used during many centuries: so that, for instance, Ps. li. had vers. 20 and 21 added; and Ps. liii. and lxx. were formed from Ps. xiv. and xl.; and Ps. cviii. was formed by throwing together parts of Ps. lvii. and lx.; and three ancient songs were compacted into one, though still appearing in our collection as two, Ps. ix. and x.; and in the Psalter there appears Ps. xviii., that song of David which he thinks he finds in its original form in 2 Sam. xxii., though he observes that the very opposite view of the relation of these two pieces is held by *De Wette*, *Hitzig*, *Ewald*, *Olshausen*, and *Hupfeld*.]

§ 113. *Age of the Anonymous Psalms.*

Of the fifty anonymous psalms, Ps. i., ii., x., xxxiii., and xliii. probably were composed about the time of David, and Ps. lxvi. in the Assyrian period. We have no means of determining the age of Ps. lxvii. Ps. lxxi. is after the time of David. Ps. xci.–c. belong to the interval between Solomon and the exile, and in part they have a strongly marked historical character, as originating in times of great catastrophes. Ps. cii. belongs to the latest period of the exile. Ps. civ., cv., and cvi. are of a somewhat later age, though we cannot determine

it more precisely. Ps. cvii. was probably composed for the first celebration of the feast of tabernacles after the return from the exile (Ezra iii. 1 ff.). Ps. cxi.–cxvi. seem to belong to the earliest times after the exile. Ps. cxvii. and cxviii. may have been destined for the festival when the foundation of the new temple was laid under the direction of Zerubbabel and Joshua (Ezra iii. 10 ff.). We might suppose Ps. cxix. to have been written by that learned student of the law, Ezra (1). Of the ten anonymous pilgrim psalms [in the Eng. version, songs of degrees], Ps. cxx., cxxi., cxxiii., cxxvi., cxxviii.–cxxx., and cxxxiv. are entirely without historical references; nor in Ps. cxxxii. is there any sure token of the age of the exile or of the succeeding age (2). Of the remainder, Ps. cxxxv. and cxxxvi. have been composed in imitation of Ps. cxv. and cxviii.; Ps. cxxxvii. is of the age of Darius Hystaspis, after Babylon had been taken a second time (3); Ps. cxlvi. is full of reminiscences of David's psalms and of those of the exile. Finally, Ps. cxlvii.–cl. have originated at one time, and are probably also by one author, who composed them for the festival of the dedication of the city wall, which Nehemiah had rebuilt (4).—Psalms of the times later than Nehemiah, or psalms of the Maccabean age, do not exist in the Canon (5).

(1) The reasons for thinking thus, and the proofs, may be seen in *Häv.* Einl. p. 248 ff. [There is fairly room, however, for questioning whether 1 Chron. xvi. does not determine this much, that Ps. xcvi., cv., and cvi. existed at least in outline from the time when David brought the ark up to Jerusalem.] *Clauss*, Beitrr. p. 4 ff., has unsuccessfully [as *Bleek* also asserts, p. 612] attempted to revive the opinion of some of the Fathers and of the Rabbins (*Augustine*, de civit. Dei, xvii. 14; *Chrysostom*, prol. in Pss.; *Euthymius Zigabenus*, præf. in Pss.; Tract. Pesach. f. 117, c. 1), that *all* the psalms were written by David. Equally destitute of foundation is the rule, "ut omnes Psalmi, qui cujus sint titulum non habent, his deputentur, quorum in prioribus Psalmis nomina continentur" (*Jerome*, epist. ad Cyprian, ii. 695).

(2) Composed by David, according to some (*Clauss*); according to others, after the dedication of Solomon's temple (*Rosenmüller*, *De Wette*, *Tholuck*); according to *Hengstb.* it presupposes the humiliation of the house of David after the exile. Comp. *Häv.* Einl. p. 269.

(3) Comp. *Hengstb.* Pss. iv. p. 432 ff.

(4) So *De Wette*, *Ewald*, *Köster*, *Hengstb.*

(5) The existence of Maccabean psalms has been accepted by *Esr. Rudinger*, *Herm. v. d. Hardt*, *Venema*; in an especial manner, *E. G. Bengel* (dissert. ad introduct. in librum Pss. supplementa quædam exhibens, Tubingæ 1806), *Bertholdt* (Einl. v. p. 1921), *Paulus*, *Kaiser*, *Hitzig* (Begriff der Kritik, p. 91 ff.; Psalmen, ii. p. 114 ff., asserting that, "from the seventy-third onwards, there is not one psalm earlier than the age of the Maccabees"), *H. Hesse* (de Psalmis Maccab., Vratislaviæ 1837), *von Lengerke* (Pss. p. xxviii. ff.), *Olshausen* [of whom *Bleek* says, p. 619, "He does not place a single psalm in the age of David and Solomon, but by far the most of them in that of the Maccabees, down to the time of John Hyrcanus"], *Herzfeld* (Geschichte des Volks Jisrael, iii. pp. 24–5, 70–1), and *P. de Jong* (disquis. de Pss. Maccab., Lugduni Batavorum 1857), who, however, holds that only four can be proved to be of Maccabean origin (p. 53). This hypothesis, which conflicts with the spirit of the Maccabean age, and with the history of the Canon, has been combated by *Gesenius*, in the Allg. Litter. Zeitung, 1816, Eng. Bl. No. 81, p. 643; *C. D. Hassler*, Commentat. crit. de Psalmis Maccab., P. i. ii., Ulm 1827 and 1832, 4to; *De Wette* (Comment., and also Einl. § 270); *Hengstb.* Pss. iv. pp. 557–8; *Fr. Boettcher*, de Inferis rebusque post mortem futuris ex Hebr. et Græc. opinionibus, l. ii., Dresden 1846, i. p. 219; *Ewald*, bibl. Jahrb. vi. p. 20 ff.; *E. Meier*, Geschichte d. poet. National Lit. pp. 496 ff., 571; and others. [*Bleek*, pp. 619–20, pronounces *Ewald's* remarks "recht gut;" and generally his conclusions are the same as *Keil's*. He thinks the collection was completed and bound up with "the Prophets" by Nehemiah, in accordance with the statement 2 Macc. ii. 13; and that it must also have been complete before the composition of 1 Chron. xvi. 36, and before the Septuagint translation was made, for it contains most of the superscriptions. In fact, he thinks a large number of the psalms were composed by the prophets before the exile.] Comp. *Häv.* Einl. iii. p. 17 ff.

§ 114. *Origin of the Collection of the Psalms.*

Our collection of the Psalms has been made at one time, and it would seem under the charge of one man, on account of the principle which is easily recognised running through it, of internal and real [not formal] affinity of the Psalms, of resemblance in their subject-matter, and of identity in tendency and destination (1). According to this real principle of resemblance and analogy in the

individual songs, the first place in the collection is allotted to the psalms of David and his contemporaries—namely, Asaph and his choir, Ethan, Heman, and the other sons of Korah, who were reckoned the creators and masters of psalmody. Then, according to the prevalent use of the two divine names *Jehovah* and *Elohim*, which divides them into two classes (2), the psalms of these master-singers were distributed into three books: so that the *first* book was the position assigned to the Jehovah psalms of David; the *second* book to the Elohim psalms of the sons of Korah, of Asaph, of David, of Solomon, and of some unknown authors; and the third book to the remaining psalms of Asaph and of the sons of Korah, which are in part of a mixed character, that is, Jehovah-Elohistic, and in part purely Jehovistic (3). Further, within each of these three books, the individual psalms are arranged according to the same law of analogy; so that either their mutual internal reference, or the similarity of their occasion or their object, or the identity of superscription, or the agreement of thoughts or of words, or their coincidence in certain characteristic images and expressions, or finally, several of these impelling causes acting together, form the media for connecting these psalms in a series, like the links in a chain. In consequence, not only are the anonymous Elohim psalms (xliii., lxvi., lxxi.) incorporated with the second book, but also two anonymous Jehovah psalms (x. and xxxiii.) are incorporated with the first book; and the Davidic Ps. lxxxvi. has been arranged amongst the Korhite psalms of the third book; while Ps. i. and ii., on account of their common introductory object, and their mutual internal reference, have been placed at the head of the collection (4).

The other part of the collection has been arranged according to the same law, taking the order of time into account. In this way the psalm of Moses (xc.), as the oldest, has been placed at the head of that collection, followed by (*a*) a decade of anonymous psalms belonging to the period from Solomon's reign till the exile (xci.–c.); (*b*) a series of songs of the age of the exile and on to Ezra (Ps. ci.–cxix.); (*c*) the collection of pilgrim psalms (Ps. cxx.–cxxxiv.); (*d*) the last group, temple and halleluiah psalms (cxxxv.–cl.). Amongst these last three groups, the places which were really most suitable were assigned to those psalms of David which either served as patterns

for later poets, or had reference to the future configuration of the kingdom of God in its struggle and its victory over its enemies (5).

(1) This principle has been acknowledged and proved by *Delitzsch*, Symbolæ, p. 33 sq. Comp. also *Häv.* Einl. iii. p. 275 ff.

(2) As to this distinction, comp. the hints of *Gesenius*, thesaurus, p. 97; *De Wette*, Einl. § 271; *Hofmann*, Weissagung u. Erfüllung, i. p. 184; *Hengstb.* here and there in his Commentary; and the further development by *Delitzsch*, *l.c.* p. 1 sqq. The origin of this distinction, according to which in one series of psalms the personal divine name Jehovah is avoided with a certain degree of premeditation, and thus has been replaced by Elohim even in passages such as those in which Jehovah is everywhere else employed, cannot be derived either from the different ages in which the psalms were composed, or from a peculiar idiosyncrasy of a number of psalmists in favour of the name Elohim (against which, comp. *Delitzsch*, p. 21 sqq.), or yet from the intention of imitating the Pentateuch as a model in this respect also (*Delitzsch*). It can be due to nothing else than the intention to oppose and counterwork the mistaken tendency to think of Jehovah the God of Israel as if He were confined to being a mere national God; a tendency to which the covenant people were much exposed, on account of their being surrounded by the heathen with their national and local gods. Comp. *Häv.* Einl. pp. 277–8.

(3) In the first book Jehovah is found 272 times, and Elohim (used absolutely) 15 times; in the second book, Jehovah 30 times, Elohim 164 times; in the third book, Jehovah 44 times, Elohim 43 times; in the last two books taken together, Jehovah 339 times, Elohim 7 times. Comp. the tabular view in *Delitzsch*, p. 2 sq. In the third book the Korhite psalms are Jehovistic, and for this reason they are separated from the Korhite Elohistic psalms of the second book; but the psalms of Asaph (lxxiii.–lxxxiii.) cannot be called either Elohistic (*Delitzsch*) or Jehovistic, but are of a mixed, that is, a Jehovah-Elohistic character. Comp. *Häv.* Einl. p. 279 f.

(4) Mutual internal references connect Ps. i. and ii., ix. and x., xvi. and xvii., xix. and xx., xxi. and xxii., xxxii. and xxxiii., xlii. and xliii., and others besides. The same occasion gave origin to Ps. xx. and xxi., xlvii. and xlviii., lxxv. and lxxvi. The same title ["To the chief musician, Maschil, a psalm of David," though with certain variations in other respects] unites Ps. lii.–lv.; ["To the chief musician, Al-tashith, Michtam of David," in all but the first, which wants Al-tashith], Ps. lvi.–lx.; lxxxviii. and lxxxix., and others. There is agreement in thought in Ps. xxiii. and xxiv., xxviii. and

xxix., xxxiv. and xxxv., xlvi. and xlvii., l. and li., and others. See the proof at length in *Delitzsch*, p. 45 sqq.

(5) The Davidic Ps. ci. is brought into contact with cii., on account of its liturgical exordium and its real connection; the Davidic Ps. ciii. forms the point of departure for Ps. civ.–cvi.; the Davidic Ps. cviii.–cx., mutually connected by the idea of the Messiah as conqueror of His enemies, are placed just after Ps. cvii., because the dawn of the Messianic salvation and the gathering of Israel from among the heathen (Ps. cvi. 47) were expected along with the return of the people from the exile. For the same reason the last psalms of David (cxxxviii.–cxlv.) are arranged in the last group; while Ps. cxxii., cxxiv., cxxxi., cxxxiii., and Solomon's Ps. cxxvii., belong to the pilgrim psalms. Comp. *Delitzsch*, p. 60 sqq., and *Häv.* Einl. p. 284 ff.

If the entire collection from beginning to end is dominated by one and the same principle, according to what has now been said, then it is impossible that it can have originated by degrees out of single private collections, the care of which was undertaken at different times and by different authors (6). It must have proceeded from one man alone, and it cannot have been prepared before the time of Nehemiah, to which the latest songs of the Psalter belong (7).

(6) The many hypotheses of the recent critics on the subject of the successive origination of our collection out of various private collections, are proved by the following consideration to be arbitrary and invalid: that they have neither understood the principle of the collection, nor have given any intelligible account of a plan according to which it has been constructed. See more particulars in *Häv.* Einl. p. 291 ff. Without doubt, there were already private collections before the exile, as these were demanded by the liturgical use of the Psalter; but these earlier collections can no longer be distinguished, nor shown to exist, in our collection and its individual books. Comp. *Hengstb.* Pss. iv. p. 589 ff. [*Bleek* differs to this extent, pp. 621-2, that he thinks there is not an all-pervading principle in our collection: and that the subscription at the end of the second book, Ps. lxxii. 20, "The prayers of David the son of Jesse are ended," cannot have proceeded from the author of our present collection; as well because there are seventeen psalms in those first two books anonymous or attributed to some one else than David, as because eighteen follow in the other books which are attributed to David himself. He inclines to think that the first seventy-two psalms already existed in a collec-

tion for divine worship: and that this subscription, designating them *à potiori*, was attached by the continuator, especially if he added only the eleven following of psalms of Asaph, which seem to have been pretty early employed in divine worship along with those of David; referring in confirmation of his statement to 2 Chron. xxix. 30. He thinks there is at least considerable probability in the supposition that the first two books formed a collection before the exile.]

(7) Probably Ezra was the collector, as he laboured in Jerusalem along with Nehemiah, whose contemporary he was (Neh. viii.–x.). This is the account given already by *Jerome*, epist. 134 ad Sophron., and by the Synops. Athanas. [*Bleek*, p. 620, thinks it was Nehemiah; see also the extract from him at the end of § 113.]

The Psalter has been divided into *five* books with reference to the *five* books of Moses. For even though the distribution into three books of the Psalms of David and his contemporaries and their schools has been occasioned by the distinction of Jehovah psalms and Elohim psalms, still there is found no real [*i.e.* not formal] reason in the constitution of the Psalms themselves for the division of the rest of them into two books. And a hint of this division is even given by the doxological conclusion of Ps. cvi. 48, without looking any further; whilst the three first books are marked off by doxologies of their own, which are quite independent of the particular psalms (8).

(8) Comp. *Delitzsch*, Symb. p. 31, and *Häv.* Einl. p. 296 ff.

THE PROVERBS OF SOLOMON (מִשְׁלֵי שְׁלֹמֹה).

Commentaries:—*Maldonatus;* see § 225. *Melanchthon, V. Strigel., M. Geier. Mercerus, Coccejus, A. Schultens, Rosenmüller, Maurer;* see § 224. *Ant. Agellii*, comm. in Provv., Lutetiæ Parisiorum 1611, fol. *Chr. Ben. Michaelis*, in *J. H. Michaelis*, uberior. annotat. in Hagiogr. *J. Fr. Hirt's* vollst. Erklärung der Sprüche Salomons, Jena 1768. *Chr. Fr. Schnurrer*, Observatt. ad quæd. loca Provv. Salom., Tubingæ 1776, 4to; Dissertt. phil. crit. vol. i. *Alb. Jak. Arnoldi*, zur Exegetik u. Kritik d. Alten Test., 1 Beitr. Anmerkk. üb. einzelne Stellen d. Sprüche Salomons, Frankfurt u. Leipzig 1781. *Jo. Jac. Reiske*, conjecturæ in Jobum et Provv. Salom., Lipsiæ 1779. *J. G. Jaeger*, Observatt. in Provv. Salom. versionem Alexandrinam, Lipsiæ 1788. *Chr. G. Hensler*, Erläuterungen des 1 B. Sam. u. d.

Salom. Denksprüche, Hamburg 1796. Salomonis quæ supersunt omnia ex Ebræo Lat. vertit notasque adj. *Jos. Fr. Schelling*, Stuttgardiæ 1806. *Fr. W. C. Umbreit*, philol. crit. u. philosoph. Comm. üb. d. Sprüche Sal., nebst e. neuen Uebersetzung u. e. Einleitung in die Morgenländ, Weisheit überhaupt u. in die hebr. Salomonisch. insbesonders, Heidelberg 1826. *E. Bertheau*, die Sprüche Sal. erklärt, Leipzig 1847 (Lief. 7 des kurzgefasst. exeg. Handbuchs). Translations by *J. H. D. Moldenhauer* (with explanations of Prov., Eccl., and Cant.), Quedlinburg 1777; *J. D. Michaelis* (and Eccles., with remarks for the unlearned), Göttingen 1778; *J. Chr. Döderlein* (with remarks), Altdorf, 3d ed. 1786; *W. C. Ziegler* (with introduction and remarks), Leipzig 1791; *H. Muntinghe* (translated from the Dutch, with remarks, by *Schöll*), Frankfurt, 2 vols. 1800, 1802; *F. G. Dahler*, with the deviations of the Alexandrian version, Strassburg 1810; *C. P. W. Gramberg*, systematically arranged, with remarks and parallels, 1828. *Ewald*, poett. BB. des Alten Test. iv. 1837 [last edition, 1867]. *J. G. Vaihinger*, Sprüche u. Klaglieder, metr. übersetzt u. erklärt, Stuttgart 1857. *Ferd. Hitzig*, übersetzt u. ausgelegt, Zürich 1858. [*Delitzsch*, in his article Sprüche Salomo's in *Herzog's* Encyclopædie, refers in high terms of praise to the Hebrew Commentary of *Löwenstein*, Frankfurt am Main 1838, for defence of the Masoretic text. He also adds *Elster's* Commentary, 1858, to *Keil's* list.]

§ 115. *Names and Character.*

The Proverbs of Solomon, *Παροιμίαι Σολομῶντος*, *Proverbia*, are a fruit of the reflection of the Israelite spirit upon the divine revelation which was given in the Mosaic law, and was preserved in the peculiar providence which guided the people of Israel. They are the product of the Hebrew wisdom (1), which had received into its self-consciousness the teaching of the revealed truth, and had made it not less an object of thought and of discernment, than a motive to volition and action. And thus they consist partly of short unconnected apophthegms and pithy sentences of wisdom, which represent the truths of religion as maxims of moral thought, volition, and action; partly of more connected proverbial discourses, which comprehend the whole domain of religious knowledge and practical piety under the conception of wisdom, and develope it in opposition to the folly of sin (2).

(1) This furnishes the explanation of the name סֵפֶר חָכְמָה, applied as well to our book of Proverbs as to Ecclesiastes in the Tosephoth to Baba bathra f. 14, *b*; and of the name *σοφία* or *ἡ πανάρετος σοφία*, which the Fathers use as often in reference to our book as in reference to the proverbs of Jesus Sirach and the apocryphal book of Wisdom. See the passages in *Suiceri*, thes. eccles. ii. pp. 987–8 and 556; and *Cotelerius*, patrr. Apostol., remarks on *Clementis* ad Corinth. epist. i. 57. These names certainly first came into use with the book of Wisdom, and proceeded from the Egyptian Jews. Comp. *Häv.* Einl. iii. pp. 386–7.

(2) Consequently it is no collection of national proverbs, no "preliminary exercises of the human spirit (occupied with the first steps in the course of civilisation) in proverbs, parables, and jests, witty conceits and riddles" (*Eichhorn*, Einl. v. pp. 67 ff., 107; *Ziegler*, Denksprüche Salomons, Einl. § 1–5; and others). Against this, see *Ewald*, die Sprüche Sal. p. 6, and *Häv.* Einl. p. 381 ff. [*Bleek*, pp. 631–2, refers to the prevailing love of apophthegms and such-like sentences in the East, quoting *Jerome* on Matt. xviii. 23: "Familiare est Syris, et maxime Palæstinis, ad omnem sermonem suam parabolas jungere, ut, quod per simplex præceptum teneri ab auditoribus non potest, per similitudinem exemplaque teneatur." *Bleek* goes on to say that this is particularly the case with the Arabs, whose oral law, the Sunna, is full of sentences of this kind; and among whom there have been various poets, who have made for themselves arranged collections of such proverbs, among others the grammarian *al Meidani* (died in 1141), who endeavoured to give historical explanations of their origin; from whom he quotes the praises of proverbs, since among other things these are found in the Koran itself. Such things, however, are surely of chief value as contrasting all other collections of proverbs with this inspired book.]

The form of these proverbs is manifold. They come forth partly in simple sentences, with thesis and antithesis; partly in aphorisms and comparisons; partly in witty sententious sayings, in instructive images, and in riddles of profound signification (3).

(3) Hints of the variety in their form are given in the variety of their names. מָשָׁל, "resemblance, comparison," is the designation of the *apophthegm*, in so far as it contains generalized abstract wisdom, obtained by comparing two objects or two thoughts: then properly a *proverb*, 1 Sam. x. 12, Ezek. xviii. 2; a *poem* that is meant to teach in short and striking sentences, Num. xxiii. 7, 18, xxiv. 3, Job xxvii. 1,

xxix. 1; a *parabolic song*, Isa. xiv. 4, Mic. ii. 4, Hab. ii. 6. In view of the brilliant form of the composition, the sentence receives the name of מְלִיצָה, *sparkling* or *elegant discourse* (*Delitzsch*, zur Geschichte d. jüd. Poesie, p. 200 f., and on Hab. ii. 6 [where this word also occurs]); not "irony, mocking discourse" (*Ewald*, *Gesenius*), [who, however, in his Thesaurus, abandons this for the translation of the Septuagint, "dark saying;" in the Eng. version of Prov. i. 6, "interpretation," yet with the marginal rendering, "an eloquent speech"]: and by means of the deeper meaning concealed within the figure or the comparison, it becomes חִידָה, *a riddle* [Eng. version, "a dark saying"], Prov. i. 6.

§ 116. *Contents and Component Parts.*

According to the title (i. 1–7), which relates to the entire collection, the book of Proverbs falls into *three* sections, separated by special titles of their own, and *two* appendices:—I. A connected delineation of wisdom, and recommendation of it as the highest good after which we are to strive; and this again is subdivided into three (ch. i.–ix.) (1). II. With the new title, "The Proverbs of Solomon," (*a*) a collection of individual proverbs, mostly very short, quite loosely strung together, either by some slight association of ideas or by certain characteristic words, seldom by resemblance in the thought, often without any discernible bond of connection: they represent partly wisdom and the fear of God, partly folly and sin, in their manifold properties and the expression of them, according to their various consequences and results (x. 1–xxii. 16). (*b*) A number of more connected proverbs, consisting of two or three or more verses (xxii. 17–xxiv. 22). (*c*) Under the title, "These also [belong] to the wise," several more of these individual proverbs, embraced chiefly under the form of commands and prohibitions (xxiv. 23–34). III. Under the new title, "The Proverbs of Solomon which the men of Hezekiah king of Judah transferred" = compiled, a new collection of proverbs, with a predominance of comparisons, antitheses, and associations of ideas by means of catchwords (xxv.–xxix.).—Of the two *Appendices*, the *first* (ch. xxx.) contains the words of *Agur*, which teach the true wisdom, and the confirmation of it in life; his thoughts being clothed in highly artificial language. The *second* contains (*a*) instruction for a king, with the title, "The words of king *Lemuel*,

the prophecy that his mother taught him" (vers. 1–9); and (*b*) the praise of a virtuous woman, in the form of an alphabetical poem (vers. 10–31).

(1) In the form of an admonitory address from a father to his son, that is, of a teacher to his pupil, in the *first* subdivision (i. 8–iii. 35), after a statement of the primary requisite for acquiring wisdom, (*a*) he is warned against the seductive attractions to sin, and is exhorted to give himself up to wisdom, which loudly and powerfully cries to men to follow her, ch. i.; (*b*) there is a picture drawn of the abundantly blessed fruit of the willing and earnest striving after wisdom, ch. ii.; (*c*) he is instructed in the actual working of true wisdom by a number of individual precepts, ch. iii. The *second* subdivision (ch. iv.–vi.), in three paragraphs, developes and confirms at large the urgent call that he should eagerly follow wisdom, which had been given at i. 8, 9. The *third* subdivision (ch. vii.–ix.) warns and instructs by exhibiting wisdom and folly as thinking, living forms or persons, in their inner nature and their acting, their life and movements. [More decidedly, we should prefer to say, the hypostatical Wisdom of God, or God the Word, manifests His personality in this introduction with such a measure of plainness as was suitable to the economy then existing, and the degree of knowledge suitable to the Church at that period; not without the indication that folly and sin were no mere abstractions, but that they resided in living beings who ever aimed at counterworking the gracious purposes and invitations of God to men. Compare with this the exhibition of the person of Satan in the book of Job, whose composition *Keil*, in common with probably the best critical authorities, places in the reign of Solomon, that is, very much contemporaneously with this book.]

§ 117. *The Author of Prov.* i.–xxix.

The great fame which Solomon acquired by his wisdom (1) tends very much to confirm the titles in this collection of proverbs,—titles which trace back all the proverbs to that wise king. Neither the multitude nor the variety of them is so great as to surpass the measure of Solomon's gifts and wisdom (2). And neither the language and the poetical form, nor yet the many-sided contents of the book, furnish occasion for well-founded doubts of Solomon's authorship (3).

(1) Not only did Solomon surpass all his contemporaries in

wisdom, but his fame in this respect spread far and wide beyond the boundaries of his kingdom (1 Kings v. 14, x. 1 ff.); and the statement that he spoke 3000 proverbs, 1 Kings v. 12, makes it clear that he gave utterance to that wisdom in memorable sentences.

(2) Against the exaggerations in this respect of *Eichhorn*, Einl. v. p. 99 f., *Ziegler*, p. 23, and *Bertholdt*, Einl. v. p. 2071, compare *Herbst*, Einl. ii. 2, p. 224; *Bertheau*, Sprüche, p. xxiii.; and my own remarks in *Häv.* Einl. pp. 404–5.

(3) After *Ziegler*, pp. 25–6, had alleged that the proverbs in ch. xxv.–xxix. were later than the age of Solomon, on account of their more intricate and enigmatic form, *Ewald* undertook to determine with greater precision the dates of the origination of the individual parts. Looking to the difference in the language, the form, and the matter, in the three principal divisions of the book, he tried to establish the hypothesis that ch. x.–xxii. 16 formed the most ancient collection, originating about two centuries after Solomon; that the collection ch. xxv.–xxix. dates from not earlier than the end of the eighth century; and finally, that in the first half of the seventh century, first the introduction (ch. i.–ix.), and soon afterwards the supplement (ch. xxii. 17–xxiv. 34), came to be united to the original of our present book (that is, ch. x.–xxii. 16), and this whole was then connected with ch. xxv.–xxix. The baselessness of this hypothesis has been already shown publicly by *Bertheau*, p. xxvii. ff. Yet he himself also not only denies that Solomon was the author of ch. i. 8–ix. 18, and xxii. 17–xxiv. 34, but is also inclined to discover that proverbs by different writers have been brought together in ch. x.–xxii. 16 and xxv.–xxix.; and he attempts to confirm the view that the individual parts of the book contain collections of proverbs which have been drawn from various sources, written and oral, and that possibly these sources have been very numerous. Against this, comp. *Hahn* in *Reuter's* Repertorium, new series, xiv. p. 85 ff., and *Häv.* Einl. p. 392 ff. [*Bleek*, p. 634, thinks we may "conjecture with probability" that ch. x. 1–xxii. 16 is the original book, with the title "Proverbs of Solomon;" yet in its present shape in all probability not from Solomon's own hand, though doubtless containing many genuine proverbs of his. He does not pretend to decide whether or not xxii. 17–xxiv. 22 and xxiv. 23–34 had been already incorporated with the book before the men of Hezekiah added their supplement, ch. xxv.–xxix.; but in no case can those portions be later than it. *Delitzsch*, on Job, p. xv., assumes the correctness of the view that the composition of the Hebrew books on the subject of wisdom extended over several centuries; and he is disposed to assign the

introductory chapters in the book of Proverbs to the age of Jehoshaphat. See also his article in *Herzog*.]

The difference of language which has been discovered in the different parts of the book, is reducible to a very small number of words, expressions, and images, which are indeed peculiar to the several parts of the work. But they may be seen at once to be useless for the purpose of distinguishing the more ancient from the more recent compositions in it, inasmuch as it is usual for every considerable portion of a poetical work to have peculiar images and turns of expression (4); and yet, besides, the *usus loquendi* remains essentially the same in all the parts (5).

(4) Of the expressions peculiar to "the older collection," to which *Ewald* gives prominence, the only real peculiarities in this part are the phrases and words, עַד אַרְנִיעָה, xii. 19; יָד לְיָד, xi. 21, xvi. 5; הִתְנַבֵּל, xvii. 14, xviii. 1, xx. 3; and נִרְגָּן, xvi. 28, xviii. 8. The others occur, some of them in other parts of the book, and some in other books: the image of *the tree of life*, xi. 30, xiii. 12, xv. 4, is also in iii. 18, and that of *the fountain of life*, x. 11 and often, also in Ps. xxxvi. 10; מַרְפֵּא, xii. 18 and often, also in iv. 22, vi. 15, xxix. 1; מָחְתָּה, x. 14, 15, and often, also in Ps. lxxxix. 41; יָפִיחַ, used relatively, xii. 17 and often, also in vi. 19, Ps. xii. 6; סָלַף, xiii. 6 and often, already in Ex. xxiii. 8, Deut. xvi. 19, Job xii. 19; לֹא יִנָּקֶה, xi. 21 and often, also in vi. 29; רָדַף, xi. 19 and often, also in Ps. vii. 6 (*Kethîbh*), Hos. ii. 9, Nah. i. 8; and יֵשׁ, prefixed to the whole sentence, xi. 24 and often, already in Num. ix. 20, 21, and afterwards in Ezra x. 44, Neh. v. 2 ff., Eccles. i. 10, ii. 21, vii. 15.—The following are said by *Ewald* to be new in the two other collections: רְאֵיתָ at the beginning, calling attention to something which was to be seen, xxvi. 12, [and an equivalent word] xxix. 20, [this latter] is found also in xxii. 29; the conditioning perfect, without אִם, xxv. 16, xxiv. 10, occurs in almost all the poets of the Old Testament (comp. *Ewald*, ausführliche Lehrbuch d. hebr. Sprache, § 357, *b*); the figure and that to which it refers united by the simple ,, xxv. 3, 20, 25, xxvi. 3, and often, or without the conjunction, xxv. 11–14, 18, and often,—yet on the contrary comp. xi. 22, 16, Job v. 7, xii. 11, etc.; זָרָה or נָכְרִיָּה, of a woman not belonging to the family, or an adulteress, ii. 16, v. 3, 20, vi. 24, and often, yet comp. xxii. 14, xxiii. 33, also comp. xxiii. 17 with ii. 16, vii. 5; finally, חָכְמוֹת, *wisdom*, i. 20, ix. 1, xxiv. 7, the one conception peculiar to these sections of the book, which the Masoretes have set aside

in xiv. 1 by a different punctuation [הַכְמוֹת]. Equally unimportant and unconvincing, because partly unfounded and partly to be explained by the subject-matter, are the linguistic differences to which *Bertheau*, p. xxi. ff., attaches value; comp. *Hahn*, *ib.* p. 92 ff., and *Häv.* Einl. p. 407 ff.

(5) Among the great number of characteristic words and phrases which are peculiar to this book, which however recur quite in equal proportions in all the parts of it, notice only פָּרַע, *to reject*, i. 25, iv. 15, viii. 33, and xiii. 18, xv. 32, and xxix. 18; יוֹסֵף לֶקַח, i. 5, ix. 9, and xvi. 21, 23; שָׂכֶל טוֹב, iii. 4 and xiii. 15 (elsewhere only Ps. cxi. 10 and 2 Chron. xxx. 22, by imitation); אָגַר, *to collect*, vi. 8 and x. 5 (elsewhere only Deut. xxviii. 39); מְדָנִים, *strife*, vi. 14, 19, and x. 12, together with מְדָנִים, xviii. 18, 19 [*Qrî*], xix. 13, and מְדָנִים, xxi. 9, 19, xxiii. 29, and xxv. 24, xxvi. 21, xxvii. 15; שָׁלַח מְדָנִים, vi. 14, 19, and שָׁלַח מָדוֹן, xvi. 28; גֶּרֶה מָדוֹן, xv. 18 and xxviii. 25, xxix. 22; חֲסַר לֵב, *senseless*, vi. 32, vii. 7, ix. 4, 16, and x. 13, 21, xi. 12, xii. 11, xv. 21, xvii. 18, and xxiv. 30 (nowhere else); אִישׁוֹן לַיְלָה, vii. 9, and אִישׁוֹן חֹשֶׁךְ, xx. 20; הֵעִז פָּנִים, vii. 13, and הֵעִז בְּפָנָיו, xxi. 29; דֶּלֶף טֹרֵד, *a continual dropping*, xix. 13 and xxvii. 15; חָרַשׁ רַע, iii. 29, vi. 14, and xii. 20, xiv. 22 [in iii. 29 it is the feminine]; תָּקַע כַּף, synonymous [and parallel] with עָרַב, vi. 1, and xvii. 18, and xxii. 26; יִשְׁכְּנוּ אֶרֶץ, ii. 21 and x. 30; שׁוּחָה עֲמֻקָּה, xxii. 14 and xxiii. 27 [more accurately the former is עֲמֻקָּה], applied to the adulteress; לְשׁוֹלֵחַי, x. 26 and xxv. 13, comp. xxii. 21; טוֹב עַיִן, xxii. 9, and רַע עַיִן, xxiii. 6, xxviii. 22. There are other not less characteristic words, which occur only here and there in other books. Comp. *Häv.* Einl. p. 395.

The form or manner of composition is indeed different in the different parts, in so far as the sentences in x.–xxii. 16 are mostly of two clauses, and antithetically constructed, with perfect proportion in the clauses; on the other hand, in xxii. 17–xxix. they often consist of three clauses, also several sentences extend over two verses, and they are constructed synthetically, and instead of pure antitheses they contain figures and comparisons; while, finally, ch. i.–ix. contain connected developments and delineations. But these differences are accounted for sufficiently by the principle which has been followed in the collection of these multifarious proverbs—the principle of placing together as much as possible those sentences which are similarly constructed, and grouping them into one part of the collection. Consequently these differences cannot do away with the unity of the

composition; since poets with good talents are not one-sided, and do not always and in all circumstances confine themselves to one and the same form, but change that form in accordance with the subject and with the object they have in view. Neither can these differences be turned into criteria of the respective dates of composition of the several parts of the collection (6). Even the recurrence of individual clauses, in different proverbs and in different contexts, is no proof of plurality of authors: it only shows that the poet has uttered more than once the thought that lived within him, and has applied it in various ways; for the repetition of such portions of a proverb in manifold combinations has not proceeded from poverty of thought, nor does it bear the character of a later working up of more ancient proverbs (7). Finally, the contents of all the parts show one and the same historical background, corresponding to the relations, ideas, and circumstances of Solomon's time, as well as to the progress then made in cultivation, and the experience of life which had been acquired at the time by the political development of the people (8).

(6) Comp. *Bertheau*, p. xxxi., and *Häv.* Einl. p. 397 ff.

(7) In reply to the numerous insinuations of *Ewald*, that many proverbs occur in ch. xxv.–xxix. which have derived their origin from older proverbs by transforming or retouching them, *Bertheau*, p. xxx. f., has rightly remarked: "From a comparison of xxv. 24 with xxi. 9, xxvi. 3 with x. 13*b*, xxvi. 13 with xxii. 13, xxvi. 15 with xix. 24, xxvi. 22 with xviii. 8, xxvii. 12 with xxii. 3, xxvii. 13 with xx. 16, xxvii. 15 with xix. 13*b*, xxvii. 21 with xvii. 3, xxviii. 6 with xix. 1, xxviii. 19 with xii. 11, xxviii. 24*b* with xviii. 9, xxix. 13 with xxii. 2, xxix. 22 with xv. 18, it follows in my opinion, and also according to *Ewald's* own view, that the stamp of greater originality is borne by the proverb sometimes in the form in which it stands in the third part, sometimes in that form in which it stands in the second; so that from the variations of the proverbs in the second and the third parts, no conclusion can be drawn as to the earlier origin of the one or of the other collection." Comp. with this, *Häv.* Einl. pp. 399 f. and 406–7.—Even from the repetition of entire proverbs we cannot conclude that some parts of the book originated later, nor yet that there were several authors; both because the repetitions are not numerous, and because they occur even in the first part, which certainly forms one connected and well-arranged whole; comp. ii. 16 with vii. 5, iii. 15 with viii. 11, ix. 4 with ix. 16, xiv. 12 with xvi. 25, xiii. 14 with

xiv. 27, xix. 5 with xix. 9, xvi. 2, xxi. 2. And there are repetitions within each of the other parts: vi. 10, 11, in xxiv. 33, 34; xii. 11 in xxviii. 19 (with slight alterations); xviii. 8 in xxvi. 22; xxi. 9 in xxv. 24; xxii. 3 in xxvii. 12; and xx. 16 in xxvii. 13.

(8) The opposite assertions of *Ewald* are refuted by *Bertheau*, p. xxxi., and in *Häv.* Einl. p. 400 ff.; and the objections by *Bertholdt*, Einl. pp. 2176, 2181, and 2186, and by *De Wette*, Einl. § 281, that many of the proverbs would be unbecoming or unsuitable for Solomon, are met by *Umbreit*, Sprüche, p. lxi.

Hence we must not so interpret the superscriptions which name Solomon as the author, as if the whole of the proverbs were ascribed to him on account of his having laid the foundation of this kind of composition, and having taken a large share in the authorship of the most ancient collection (9). Much rather we must hold him to be the author of the entire collection of proverbs; though this does not make us deny (what is implied in the very nature of these sententious observations) that he merely accepted many of them which proceeded from other wise men, and incorporated them in his own collection.

(9) *Umbreit*, p. lviii. ff.; *Ewald*, p. 29 ff.; *De Wette*, § 281; and others.—It is quite arbitrary in *Ewald* and *Bertheau* to interpret xxii. 17, "Hear the words of the wise," of "utterances of *various* sages;" and "These [things] also [belong] to the wise," xxiv. 23, of "selected utterances of *more recent* sages." Against this, comp. *Häv.* Einl. p. 410 f. [*Bleek*, p. 633, seems very much to agree with them as to the latter passage, which he renders, "Auch dies ist *von* Weisen," though he says the translation "*für* Weise" is admissible, only less probable.]

§ 118. *Authorship of the Appendices, ch.* xxx. *and* xxxi.

The sayings in ch. xxx. and xxxi. are not by Solomon. On the contrary, the wise instructions in ch. xxx. are by *Agur* the son of Jakeh, an unknown sage (1), who can scarcely have lived before Hezekiah's time [?], the age of the prophets, on account of his sayings being designated מַשָּׂא and נְאֻם, "an utterance from God." "The words of *Lemuel*, a king, a prophetic utterance, which his mother taught him," xxxi. 1–9, would seem from this superscription to have been written down by Lemuel from recollection. Yet as *Lemuel* is manifestly a symbolical name (2), perhaps this also may proceed from

Agur, as well as the song in praise of the virtuous woman, vers. 10-31, which is appended to it without any superscription. The highly artificial nature of Agur's sayings, the Chaldaisms בַּר and יְלָדִין (xxxi. 2, 3), and the alphabetical structure of the song in xxxi. 10 ff., are insufficient to enable us to determine the date of composition (3).

(1) Against the opinion of *Jerome*, of several Rabbins, and of *Hahn, ibid.* p. 97, that Agur is a symbolical designation of Solomon [in the sense of "the Collector," like Koheleth, "the Preacher," says *Bleek*, p. 633; agreeing with *Keil* here, and pronouncing the epithet unsuitable to Solomon], the additional words, "the son of Jakeh," are decisive; whereas the names Ithiel and Ucal, that is, "God with me," and "I am strong," have been undoubtedly formed by the poet himself to designate a class of free-thinkers who are proud of their own wisdom: comp. *Häv.* Einl. p. 412. [*Bleek, ibid.*, rejects this opinion; though he says it is also that of *Ewald*, Stud. u. Krit. 1828, 2, pp. 343–4, and in his Commentary on Proverbs. There is certainly an antecedent probability that *all* the names are either real or else merely symbolical.]

(2) Lemuel is not an Arabian or Edomite Emir (*Ziegler, Rosenmüller*, and others). [Yet the editors of *Bleek*, p. 634, note, observe that "*Hitzig* finds in the מַשָּׂא of xxx. 1 and xxxi. 1 a kingdom of Massa in Arabia (Gen. xxv. 14; 1 Chron. i. 30), formed by the Simeonite emigrants, 1 Chron. iv. 38–41; and in this kingdom he reckons that these two chapters originated. At the same time, he greatly alters the punctuation and the division of the words. Compare his acute reasoning to establish this view, in "Das Königreich Massa" in *Zeller's* theol. Jahrb. 1844, pp. 269–305, and "Die Sprüche Sal. 1858." *Bertheau* (die Sprüche Sal. in the Exeg. Handbuch, 1847) essentially agrees with him; comp. also *Hahn* (in *Reuter's* Repertorium, new series, xiv.), and *Bunsen*, Bibelwerk, Einl. p. clxxviii. ff.] It is a fictitious name, meaning "To God," that is, related to God, or devoted to God (*Eichhorn*, v. p. 106; *Ewald*, Sprüche, p. 173); yet hardly of the same signification with Jedidiah in 2 Sam. xii. 25 (*A. Schultens*), or a distorted form of שְׁלֹמֹה (*M. Geier, Schelling*, and others).

(3) The attempts, by changes in the text of xxx. 1 and xxxi. to determine more precisely the origin of these pieces, and to make Lemuel king of an imaginary kingdom of Massa [see the authorities already given in the addition to the preceding note: *Delitzsch* also manifests an inclination towards this view, in his article on Proverbs in *Herzog*, and he thinks of perhaps מַשָּׂא, Gen. x. 30], have no point

of support in the arbitrary rendering of these verses by the Septuagint, nor have they the slightest probability in themselves. See them refuted in *Häv.* Einl. p. 415 ff.

§ 119. *Origin of the Book of Proverbs.*

According to xxv. 1, the editing of the entire collection (ch. i.–xxix.) cannot have proceeded from Solomon. And further, a comparison of the nature of the collection of proverbs of Solomon which has been handed down to us (ch. x.–xxii.), with the notice of this king's proverbs contained in 1 Kings v. 12, 13, shows that this collection contains merely an extract from a greater collection, probably made at successive times by the wise king himself, and embracing the most various domains of science and of life; the object of these selected proverbs being the true wisdom of life and godliness, whilst in form they were the simplest and the most similar (1). From the beginning there was prefixed to this selection an introduction (i. 8–ix. 18), which forms one well-adjusted and connected whole (2); and the work in this shape was provided with a superscription, i. 1–7 (3). —Also the supplement xxii. 17–xxiv. 22, with the appendix xxiv. 23–34, has been attached by the editor of this collection, and not by some one only at a later time; the supplemental form being given to these portions because they contain more connected sentences, whose peculiar structure rendered them unsuitable for insertion in the second part (4).

(1) The 3000 proverbs which Solomon spoke, according to 1 Kings v. 12, 13, embraced the entire domain of human wisdom, the science of nature as well as the circle of moral and religious truth; on the contrary, the 500 or 600 proverbs in our collection, as a whole, move within the circle of religion and morality. These last can therefore be nothing else than a selection made upon this particular plan. But such a selection presupposes the completion of the greater work, and therefore it cannot have been made before the closing part of Solomon's reign; and it would not be made by himself [?], on account of his inclination to idolatry in his old age, 1 Kings xi. The objections of *Ewald* (pp. 26 ff.) to this representation proceed upon the wholly unwarranted supposition that the book of Proverbs composed by Solomon was arranged according to a strictly logical course of thought and connection. Comp. my remarks in reply, in *Häv.* Einl. p. 424 ff.

(2) That the introduction, i. 8–ix., belongs to a later age than that of the short proverbs, ch. x.–xxii. (*Ewald*), is an unfounded assertion which cannot be proved. Neither its language nor its subject-matter justifies us in denying that it proceeded from Solomon.

(3) To wish to distinguish the author of the superscription from the collector of the proverbs would be "a thoroughly arbitrary commencement" (*Bertheau*, p. xxxiv.); but besides, it has been at once rendered impossible by the intimate relation in which the superscription stands to both the parts of this collection. Comp. *Hahn*, *ibid.* p. 98 f. It is an arbitrary inference of *Bertheau's* from "The proverbs of Solomon," x. 1, that the collector has declared the first nine chapters not to be Solomon's, by giving this superscription to the collection of proverbs strictly so called: against this, comp. *Häv.* Einl. pp. 428–9.

(4) That these appendices have the same author as i. 8–xxii. 16, is proved by their close relationship to both ch. i.–ix. and ch. x.–xxii. 16, in language and in turns of expression. Comp. *Häv.* Einl. p. 408 ff.

Whether this first collection took place during Solomon's own life, or whether it was made soon after, is a question which must remain undetermined. Only this much is certain, that in Hezekiah's time it had already been long in existence. For under this king, learned men gleaned the sayings of Solomon (we may conjecture that very work of which the earlier collector had made use, and which had been preserved down to this time alongside of the extract from it), and combined both it and that earlier extract with our present selection (ch. i.–xxix.) (5). No doubt it was these learned men of Hezekiah who also attached to the complete selection the appendices ch. xxx. and xxxi. (6).

(5) This collection made in Hezekiah's time did not originate independently of that older one, but was undertaken with reference to it. This is proved partly by the circumstance that none of the proverbs found in the first reappear in the second collection, except three or four, whose reception into the former collection had been overlooked [?] (comp. xxvii. 12, 13, and xxv. 24, with xxii. 3, xx. 16, and xxi. 9; also xxvi. 22 with xviii. 8); partly by the superscription, "These are *also* proverbs of Solomon," xxv. 1. Comp. *Häv.* Einl. p. 429 ff.

(6) "No one will easily be able to prove that our book of Proverbs as far as ch. xxix. was in existence at a time earlier than that

in which the proverbs and the song in ch. xxx. and xxxi. were composed" (*Bertheau*, p. xxxvii.).

THE BOOK OF JOB (אִיּוֹב).

Commentaries:—*Joa. de Pineda*, commentariorum in librum Job., libri xiii., 2 vols. 1537, 1601, fol. *Balth. Corderii* Jobus elucidatus, Antverpiæ 1646, 1656, fol. *Casp. Sanctius*; see § 225. *Bugenhagen*, *Brentius*, *V. Strigel*, *Seb. Schmidt*, *J. H. Michaelis*. *Œcolampadius*, *Bucer*, *Marloratus*, *Mercerus*, *Drusius*, *Coccejus*, *A. Schultens*, *Rosenmüller*, *Heiligstedt* in *Maurer*, Comm.; see § 224. Observationes miscell. in libr. Job. quibus verss. et interprett. passim epicrisis instituitur, etc. (auct. *Dav. Renat. Bouillier*), Amstelodami 1758. Das B. Job ubersetzt u. vollst. commentirt v. *H. Arnheim*, 1836. *H. Ewald*, poett. BB. Band iii., Göttingen 1836, 2d ed. 1854. *Lud. Hirzel*, d. B. Job erklärt, Leipzig 1839, 2d ed. by *J. Olshausen*, 1852 (Lief. 2 des kurzgefasst. exeg. Handbuch). *H. A. Hahn*, Comm. üb. d. B. Hiob, Berlin 1850. *Ed. Isid. Magnus*, philol. hist. Comm. zum B. Hiob, 1 Buch, Halle 1851. Translations and explanations, by *Eckermann*, Lubeck 1778. *Moldenhauer*, Leipzig 1780–1, 2 vols. 4to. *H. A. Schultens* and *H. Muntinghe*, translated from the Dutch, with the additions and remarks of *J. P. Berg*, by *K. F. Weidenbach*, Leipzig 1797. *Stuhlmann*, Hamburg 1804. *J. R. Schärer*, Bern 1818, 2 vols. *Umbreit*, Heidelberg 1824, 2d ed. 1832. *Köster* (strophical), Schleswig 1831. *J. G. Vaihinger* (metrical), Stuttgart 1842. *J. G. Stickel* (divided rhythmically, with exegetical and critical remarks), Leipzig 1842. *B. Welte*, Freiburg 1849. *Konst. Schlottmann* (translated and illustrated), Berlin 1851. *Wilh. Gleiss*, Beitrr. zur Kritik des B. Hiob, Hamburg 1845. [*F. Delitzsch*, Das Buch Job, Leipzig 1864.]

§ 120. *The Idea of the Book, its Contents, its Arrangement.*

The question, What is the relation of the sufferings of the godly to the divine righteousness? was raised in the course of the theocratic history, by living under the law, with its continual practical testimony to the righteousness of the holy God. This question forms the problem of the book of Job, which, in a grand poetical picture, represents the struggle and the victory of the godly man amid the sorest assaults of troubles and sufferings.

I. In the introduction we read how Job, who had walked in a course of lofty piety, and had lived in patriarchal good fortune and esteem, bore stedfastly, with true devotedness to God, and without a sinful word, the temptation ordained for him, at the instigation of Satan, by the divine permission, as it broke upon him in the form of stroke upon stroke,—successive misfortunes befalling him in his possessions, his family, and finally his own body (i.–ii. 10). Then we read how he succumbed only before the enhanced temptation, when his three friends, who had heard of his misfortunes and had hastened to him, kept silence throughout seven days,—thus betraying the suspicions in their minds as to the cause of this amazing fate of his. He cursed the day of his birth, and thus gave utterance to an indirect accusation of the justice of God's government, which provoked the contradiction of the friends who had come to comfort him (ii. 11–iii. 26).

II. Out of this there is woven a discussion of the reason of the sufferings of the righteous, between the three friends on the one side and Job on the other, which is carried out in three cycles of dialogues. In accordance with a widely-diffused outward apprehension of the doctrine of retribution, which considers the greatness of the good or bad fortune of the individual an infallible standard of his piety or his ungodliness, the three friends successively defend the righteousness of the divine government in the world; and at first more covertly, yet soon with greater openness, and finally without any disguise, give expression to the reproach, that the heavy afflictions of Job are the righteous punishment of great sins and iniquity, for which he is paying the penalty. On the other hand, Job is immoveably convinced of his innocence, and in these words of his friends he can find neither comfort nor correction, nor yet new instruction as to the divine government and the secret cause of his amazing sufferings; and he opposes and repulses all their assaults with such vehemence, that in the end they are compelled to hold their peace (iv.–xxvi.). Nevertheless he is himself unable to comprehend the hidden depths of the divine wisdom, or to see the solution of the dark riddle of his life (xxvii.–xxxi.).

III. And now a new combatant, Elihu, rises up from the circle of the audience, rebukes the friends for their unfounded condemnation of Job, and convicts Job of wrong, by proving that no one dare

hold himself to be pure and sinless before God, and that God chastens man with suffering precisely on account of his self-righteousness (xxxii. xxxiii.). He shows that consequently Job has sinned and has attacked the righteousness of God, when he complained of God taking away his judgment (xxxiv. xxxv.), since this righteousness is continually manifesting itself just in this, that the Almighty does not permit the transgressor to prosper, and does assist the patient godly man in getting his rights; consequently He will redeem Job from his misery, and conduct him to new good fortune, if only he do not harden himself against this God whom men ought to fear, who is incomprehensible in His ways, and who is exalted in might and in abundance of righteousness (xxxvi. xxxvii.). Upon this correction from a man there follows the revelation of the Almighty, who comes near in the whirlwind, and in majestic discourse unfolds His glory, and the wonders of His omnipotence and wisdom in the creation, preservation, and government of the world; wonders which are inconceivable to man (xxxviii.–xli.). Job is completely bowed down under this, and is brought to penitent acknowledgment of the presumption with which he had spoken; by means of this he is reconciled to his God, and he not only intercedes successfully to have his friends forgiven for their foolish speeches, but he also obtains for himself anew his former prosperity in double measure (xlii.) (1).

(1) See this more at large in *Häv.* Einl. iii. p. 300 ff.; *Gleiss*, Beitrr.; *Schlottmann*, Hiob, p. 20 ff.; *Oehler*, d. Grundzüge der alttestamentlichen Weisheit (Tüb. Progr. for 1854), p. 19 ff.; *Hengstb.* ü. d. B. Hiob, Berlin 1856 (Evang. Kirchen Zeitung, No. 16 ff.). Comp. also *J. G. L. Kosegarten*, allg. Monatschrift f. Wissensch. u. Lit., Braunschweig 1853, Sept., p. 761 ff.

This fundamental idea in the book has often been mistaken, and its object and tendency have been erroneously represented: not only by those who have found in the poem a polemic against the Mosaic doctrine of retribution (2), or an exposition of the view that the finite subject must submit unconditionally to the absolute Lord (3), or a representation of the sufferings of the people in exile (4); but also by those who have given a one-sided prominence to some single one out of the whole of the essential points, and have wished to discover the

object of the poem in the development of the idea of true wisdom (5), or of the idea of the immortality of the soul (6). [*Bleek*, pp. 651–3, also rejects the opinions referred to in Notes 2 (at least partly), 3, and 6. He thinks the great principles taught are these: *a.* That a pious man may have to suffer severe divine visitations without special sinfulness as the cause of it, and without any mark of special divine displeasure; while it may be to prove his faith and virtue: and this is expressly stated in the prologue. *b.* That on the side of man it is madness and presumption to strive with God on account of such sufferings, since His wisdom and counsel cannot be fathomed; whereas true wisdom is to fear God, and to depart from evil. *c.* That Jehovah will in the end again pity, and bless, and glorify the patient godly man who continues in his piety, and cleaves to God, or who returns if he has gone astray, and fallen into a wrong state of feeling.]

(2) *Umbreit*, Job, p. xii.; *Hirzel*, p. 2 ff.; *De Wette*, § 286; and *A. W. Krahmer*, de hist. theol. Wichtigkeit u. poet. Einheit des B. Hiob, in *Niedner's* Zeitschrift f. hist. Theol. 1857, p. 313 ff.: they erroneously identify the representations of Job's opponents with the Mosaic doctrine of retribution, reject this doctrine itself as a Jewish fancy and superstition, and slip into the book an Antinomian tendency which is at war with the whole religious teaching of the Old Testament.

(3) *Stuhlmann*, Hiob, p. xii. ff.; *Bertholdt*, Einl. v. p. 2048; *Eichhorn*, Einl. v. p. 114 ff.; *v. Cölln*, bibl. Theol. i. p. 293 ff.; *Knobel*, de carminis Jobi argumento, fine ac. dispos., Vratislaviæ 1835, § 1 ff.; *Vatke*, bibl. Theol. i. p. 576: partly also *Kern*, üb. den Inhalt u. Geist des B. Hiob, in *Bengel's* neu. Archiv, iv. p. 352 ff.; *Steudel*, Vorless. üb. d. Theologie des Alten Test. Beil. iii., üb. den Inhalt u. Zusammenhang des B. Hiob, p. 511; *Herbst*, Einl. ii. 2, p. 180; and *Heiligstedt*, in *Maurer*, Comm. iv. p. xiii. Great sections of the book must be rejected as spurious additions, in order to lend some probability to this opinion. Against it, comp. *Ewald*, Hiob, p. 56, and *Häv.* p. 316 ff.

(4) *Herm. v. der Hardt*, comment. in Job. s. historia populi Israel. in Assyriaco exilis, Helmst. 1728; *Clericus*, libri Vet. Test. Hagiogr., on ch. i. 1; *Warburton*, Divine Legation of Moses, iii. p. 205 ff.; *Bernstein*, in the Analekten v. *Keil* u. *Tzschirner*, i. 3, p. 109 ff.; *De Wette*, in the Studien v. *Daub* u. *Kreutzer*, iii. p. 278 ff., Einl. in d. Alte Test. § 290; *Br. Bauer*, Religion d. Alten Test. ii. p. 477 ff. This view makes as great a mistake about the peculiar spirit of Hebraism as

about the contents of the book of Job and the character of the exile. Against it, see *Bouillier*, Observatt. p. 9 sq.; *Herbst*, Einl. ii. 2, p. 196; and *Häv.* p. 315 f.

(5) *Baumgarten-Crusius*, libri de Jobo argumenti descript., in his Opusc. theol. p. 174 sqq.: it is quite arbitrary.

(6) Propounded in a thoroughly external manner by *J. D. Michaelis*, Einl. in d. Alte Test. i. p. 23 ff.; with greater depth by *Ewald*, Hiob, pp. 10 ff., 193 ff.: but entirely denied by *Stickel*, Hiob, p. 154 ff.; by *Hahn*, de spe immortalitatis sub Vet. Test. grad. exculta, dissert., Vratislaviæ 1845, p. 33 ff., and Comm. z. Hiob, p. 7; and by *Gleiss.* On the contrary, *Umbreit* in the Theol. Studien u. Krit. 1840, p. 242 ff.; *Vaihinger*, *ibid.* 1843, iv. p. 961 ff.; *Böttcher*, de Inferis, i. § 319 sqq.; *Schlottmann*, p. 49 ff.; *Oehler*, *ut sup.* p. 28; *Kosegarten*, *ut sup.* pp. 771–2; and *C. G. Th. Koestlin*, de immortalitatis spe quæ in l. Jobi apparere dicitur, Tubingæ 1846, 4to, rightly find an anticipation of eternal life expressed in ch. xix. 25 ff., yet only as one of the essential points in the great struggle, not as the principal idea of the poem. Comp. *Häv.* p. 318 ff.

§ 121. *Matter and Form of the Poem.*

The matter presented to us in the book of Job is to be held neither as strictly historical truth (1), nor as pure poetic fiction (2); the former view entangles us in unnatural assumptions (3), and the latter is at variance with the spirit of antiquity (4): but it is an old legend wrought up and sustained throughout with poetic freedom (5). Yet we cannot now distinguish clearly between the traditional history and the poetical additions; only we may decide this much by a safe conjecture, that besides the names of Job and his three friends, the principal features, such as Job's piety, his great good fortune in the beginning, his frightful sufferings afterwards, and the final restoration of his former fortune, may rest upon historical tradition (6).

(1) The strict historical view of the entire contents of this book is taken by *Josephus*, [who does not, however, mention Job in his history, probably because Job does not properly touch upon Israelitish history, says *Bleek*, p. 648], when, against Apion i. 8, he reckons the book among the prophetical books of the Jews; and by the most of the Rabbins, the Fathers, and the older theologians down to *Fr. Spanheim*, historia Jobi, c. 1, and *Alb. Schultens*, Commentar, i. p. 44 sqq. The Rabbins, in particular, knew how to determine not only

the age and the fatherland of Job, but also his pedigree, and the incidents of his life down to the minutest particulars. As to this, comp. *Magnus*, Comment. p. 281 ff. [*Bleek*, p. 648, says that much about the Arabian traditions, including accounts of six places which all show his grave, is to be found in *Flügel's* article Hiob in *Ersch* u. *Gruber's* Allgem. Encycl., as also in *d'Herbelot*, art. Ayub; also, that there are the additions in the Septuagint, which are of Christian origin.]

(2) The first trace of this view is the opinion expressed by the Talmudist *R. Samuel bar Nachmanja* (Bab. bathr. 15, 1): איוב לא היה ולא נברא אלא משל היה ["Job never existed, nor was created, but is a parable." *Bleek*, p. 649, says it is a common mistake to attribute this view to him, which on the contrary he combats, its author being *R. Resch Lakisch*; *Magnus*, i. p. 298, has given the correct statement. He adds, that the same view was taken among the Jews by *Maimonides*, More Nebochim, iii. 22; and among the Fathers by *Junilius*, de partibus leg. div. liber i., and by *Theodore* of Mopsuestia]. The later Rabbins endeavoured to give a different turn to this statement, but without success. Comp. *Häv.* p. 326, and *Schlottmann*, pp. 4, 5. In later times it was propounded by *Salmasius*, *Clericus*, *J. D. Michaelis*, *Dathe*, *Augusti*, *De Wette* in *Ersch* u. *Gruber's* Encyclop. art. Hiob (though differently in his Lehrbuch der Einleitung), *Bernstein*, and others. Comp. *Magnus*, p. 302 ff.

(3) This has been already shown by *Carpzov*, Introd. ii. p. 36, and still more by *J. D. Michaelis*, Einl. p. 44. [It is certainly no matter of faith, and the determination of the question either way may not lead to any results of importance. It may be doubted, however, whether the inconveniences and difficulties are not as serious on the side of those who deny the strict historical character of the book, as of those who affirm it.]

(4) "The invention of a history from the very commencement, the production from the poet's own brain of a person who is yet said to be historical, is a thing so forced and so remote, that it is altogether foreign to the early period of every nation, so that it first takes shape gradually in the latest centuries of an ancient history, and has never come fully and prominently forward till recent times" (*Ewald*, p. 16).

(5) So all the recent critics and expositors, and rightly. Already at an earlier time, *Luther* in his Table-talk (comp. his works, *Walch's* edition, xxii. p. 2093), *Rich. Simon*, hist. crit. Vet. Test. i. 8, *Huetius*, and others, had perceived and expressed this correct opinion.

(6) The texts Ezek. xiv. 14, 20, Jas. v. 11, testify to matter preserved by historical tradition, although they are not available in proof

of the historical character of the entire book. In any case, the points of principal importance in the narratives of the prologue and the epilogue rest upon ancient tradition: not merely the names of Job and his three friends (his own name meaning "the object of enmity" [the other interpretation, "the repenting, returning one," is perhaps not less probable, especially if we may compare the interchange of Jashub and Job, יָשׁוּב, in Num. xxvi. 24 and Gen. xlvi. 13]), along with the accounts of the fatherland and the dwelling-place of persons mentioned in the book, and of Job's peculiar disease, and of the final issue; but it may well be also, the main elements in the views which are wrought up in the dialogues, as to the cause of such frightful suffering by this highly esteemed and godly patriarch. Comp. *Schlottmann*, p. 9 ff.

The poet has wrought up this traditional matter with such high art, that the plan and the execution of his work as a whole, and in all its individual parts (7), excels everything which Hebrew poetry has to show in its lyrical domain, in profound ideas, in wealth of images and delineations, in freshness, liveliness, and originality of language (8).

(7) The artificial plan is seen at once in the tripartite arrangement of the whole materials, as shown already by *Köster*, Hiob, p. 5 ff.: "The book falls into three divisions,—namely, the prologue, the discourses, and the epilogue. The prologue and epilogue, again, contain each three principal points; and the discourses fall into three divisions,—those of Job and his three friends, those of Elihu, and those of Jehovah. The dialogues consist of three courses, and each course consists of thrice two speeches. Finally, in the discourses of Elihu, and in those of Jehovah, we can again distinguish three principal parts." Comp. *Schlottmann*, p. 66 ff. Besides, the art of the composition may be partly seen in the representation of the doctrine of retribution, as usually conceived, by three men who are delineated as differing in age and in character (comp. *Ewald*, Hiob, p. 33); in the manifestation by these combatants, with ever-increasing plainness, of the insufficiency of their lines of proof, as their speeches become emptier and shorter at every course, the second friend merely repeating a commonplace in the third round of the controversy, and the third friend knowing nothing whatever to say. That art may also be partly seen in the peculiar way in which Elihu assigns his motive for coming forward, and in the acute way in which his discourses bring forward the true and the false in the discourses of the contending

parties, and in the preparation made at the close for the appearing of Jehovah, etc.

(8) The poem has been called an epic (*J. H. Stuss*, de Epopoia Jobæa commentt. iii., Gotha 1753, 4to; *Lichtenstein*, num lib. Job. cum Odyssea Homeri comparari possit, Helmst. 1773, 4to; *Ilgen.* Jobi antiquis. carminis Hebr. natura atque virtus, Lipsiæ 1789), or a drama, a tragedy, to be divided into acts and scenes (*Mercerus*, *Beza*, and others; comp. *Carpzov*, p. 76 sq. [to which view *Delitzsch* inclines; see his article in *Herzog's* Encycl.]). But all this has failed to throw light upon either the contents or the form of the book. Comp. *Lowth*, de sacr. poesi Hebr. præl. xxxiii.

§ 122. *Age and Author of the Book.*

The book of Job has proceeded neither from the age of Moses nor from an earlier age (1); nor yet from the age of the exile, or that which succeeded it (2). The *former* view confounds the poet's date with that of his hero, and identifies the air of patriarchal primitive times which breathes through the poem with the age of the poet; while it entirely overlooks the two facts, that the way and manner of handling the problem which is to be solved presupposes a longer life under the law (3), and that the artificial plan and execution of the poem presuppose an earlier cultivation and development of lyric and apophthegmatic poetry. The *latter* view is founded chiefly upon the Aramaisms of the book, entirely ignoring the not less numerous Arabisms which would be simply inexplicable in the age of the exile (4); also upon the supposed national tendency of the poem (5); and upon the pretended Persian origin, at a later time, of its peculiar representations of Satan and the angels (6).

(1) It was assigned to a date earlier than that of Moses by several Fathers, Talmudists, and Rabbins (comp. *Carpzov*, p. 52 sq.); by *Bertholdt*, p. 2120; *Eichhorn*, v. § 641; *Ilgen*, *Stuhlmann*, and others. [*Bleek*, p. 658, says this is the opinion of *Carpzov* himself, and of *Jahn*. He notices that the author was reckoned to be an Idumean by *Ilgen*, Jobi antiquissimi carminis Hebraici natura atque virtutes, Lipsiæ 1789, as it was by *Herder*, Geist d. hebr. Poesie, vol. i.; but adds that this opinion may now be considered antiquated, the Israelite origin of the book being once again universally acknowledged; referring on this point to *Bernstein*, *ut supra*, and to *De Wette*, § 291,

Anm. *a.* This fancy is also noticed incidentally by *Keil* himself in this section, Notes 13 and 14.] It was assigned to the age of Moses by *Saadia* in *Ewald* and *Duke's* Beitrr. i. p. 78; by various Greek, Syrian, and Latin Fathers; and by later theologians, *J. D. Michaelis*, *Jahn*, *Hufnagel*, and others. Comp. *Magnus*, Comm. p. 330.

(2) It is affirmed that the book was composed during the exile, by [*Bleek*, p. 659, says *H. v. d. Hardt*, as to whose view see already § 120, Note 4] *Clericus*, *Warburton*, *Grotius:* especially by *Bernstein; Gesenius*, Geschichte der hebr. Sprache, p. 33 ff.; *Umbreit*, Comm. p. xlvii. ff.; *Knobel*, Commentatt. p. 6; *v. Cölln*, bibl. Theol. i. p. 50; *De Wette*, in the first four editions of his Einleitung; and by others. It was thrown later than even the exile, into the fifth century, by *Hartmann*, die enge Verbindung des Alten u. Neuen Test. p. 393; *Vatke*, bibl. Theol. i. 563; *E. Meier*, Gesch. d. poet. National Lit. p. 545 ff. [*Bleek*, pp. 658–9, prefers to think, apparently on very slender grounds indeed, that the writer lived after the time of David and Solomon, but before the exile, probably between the Assyrian and the Babylonian captivities. The events of this period seem to him best to suit passages such as xii. 17 ff., xv. 18, 19. As to this date, see a little more towards the end of Note 7.]

(3) The following considerations prove that the poet belongs not to the patriarchal age, in which his hero lives, but to a later one; in spite of the thoroughly sustained antique character, by means of which he coincides with Genesis in many expressions, withdraws himself entirely from the written Mosaic law, and in his delineations throws himself with peculiar predilection into the simple patriarchal world: comp. *Hāv.* p. 338 ff. 1. The very problem with which he deals; for this presupposes so deep a view of sin, of guilt, and of evil, that it could be attained only by a pretty long life spent under the law. 2. Various representations are adopted, which belong to a later stage of religious development, with which we meet first in the poetry of the Psalms; for instance, that of Sheol, iii. 17–19, vii. 7*e* [ff. ?], xiv. 10 ff., xvi. 22, xvii. 6 [16 ?], and others. 3. Certain allusions to the Mosaic law, such as can scarcely be denied: comp. v. 14 with Deut. xxviii. 29; xxxi. 11 with Lev. xviii. 17, xx. 14; and *Hāv.* pp. 340–1. 4. Finally, the thoroughly formed artificial structure of the strophes, and the very regular parallelism of the clauses; and generally the whole form of the poem, so finished in every respect, with which no lyrical production of an age earlier than David's can be placed in comparison. [The probability that it belongs to the age of David and Solomon rather than to that of Moses, is certainly considerable; but this is all that can be safely affirmed,

and much may be said on the other side. The arguments adduced in this Note will have no decisive weight with many minds.]

(4) Comp. especially *Bernstein*, p. 49 ff.; *Gesenius, ut supra.* In addition to the one-sided prominence given to the Aramaisms, while the Arabisms are utterly neglected, though they had been already remarked by *Jerome* in his preface to Daniel, the fact is overlooked that the so-called Aramaisms are to be found in the very earliest specimens of poetry, and are to be regarded in general as a peculiarity of the poetic diction, which makes use of rare modes of expression for the sake of ornament; not to say that many a time there is a necessity, owing to the parallelism of thoughts, to make encroachments upon the linguistic domain of the Aramaic dialect. Comp. *Hirzel*, Job, p. 11.

(5) "But the principal proof lies in the reference to the sufferings and the teleology of the Hebrews, and in the advance in this kind of philosophizing when compared with the cognate psalms and proverbs of Solomon" (*De Wette*, Einl. § 291, *d*). Comp. § 120, Note 4, for the mistake which lies at the foundation of the first point: the proof of the second point has still to be produced.

(6) The Persian origin of the Hebrew doctrine of Satan is just as little capable of proof, as the opinion of *Herder*, *Ilgen*, *Eichhorn*, and *Ewald* (Hiob, p. 64), that the representation of Satan in our book is different from that of the later Hebrew Satanology. Against this, comp. *Schlottmann*, p. 38 ff.—Equally unfounded are the rest of the pretended later religious representations given by *De Wette, ut supra.* Against these, comp. *Häv.* pp. 350–1.

The form and the subject-matter, the spirit and the language of the poem, indicate that it originated in the age when Hebrew poetry flourished most, or in the age of Solomon (7). Not only is our book presupposed in Ezek. xiv. 14 ff.; Jeremiah also has made manifold use of it (8), and already in Isaiah and Amos there are unmistakeable allusions and references to it (9). We are led back to a still higher antiquity by the affinity of its ideas and its language to the writings of the age of David, and especially to those of Solomon. On the one hand, several psalms of the time of the exile have unmistakeably borrowed from the book of Job; on the other, in the older psalms of the age of David we do indeed find many cognate ideas, yet not in the form of reminiscences or borrowings, but as single individual essential features in the frame and turn of mind of suffering godly

men, which recur in the book of Job combined into one grand comprehensive and carefully executed picture (10). Much more numerous are the points of contact in the book of Job and in the Proverbs: sometimes in the ideas, such as the delineation of Wisdom and the representations of Sheol; sometimes in a multitude of words and expressions common to both, which indicate that they were composed at the same period (11). And when we take these in connection with the abundance of new views and images which meet us in this book, and with which the Israelites first became acquainted by means of Solomon's trade and navigation (12), its composition under his brilliant reign becomes a certainty.

(7) This is the view of *R. Nathan* in baba bathr. f. 15, Sota Jerusch. f. 20, 3; *Gregory Nazianzen*, Orat. ix.; *Luther* (Table-talk); *Döderlein* [Scholia in libr. Vet. Test. poet., Halæ 1779, says *Bleek*, p. 659]; *Stäudlin* (Beitrr. z. Philos. u. Gesch. d. Religion, ii. p. 260 ff.); *Richter*, de ætate libri Job. defin., 1790, § 11; *Rosenmüller*, Schol. i. A, p. 35; *Vaihinger*, in theol. Studien u. Kritik., 1846, p. 159 ff.; *Häv.* p. 351 ff.; *Hahn*, Hiob, p. 28; *Schlottmann*, p. 108 ff.; [*Welte*, says *Bleek*, p. 659;] and others. On the contrary, *Ewald*, p. 62, *Heiligstedt*, p. xxiii., *Magnus*, pp. 333–4, decide in favour of the commencement of the seventh century, on thoroughly insufficient grounds: comp. *Schlottmann*, p. 110 f. [The view of *Bleek* has been already mentioned in the addition to Note 2 of this section, that the composition falls in the period between the Assyrian and the Babylonian captivities. For this opinion he claims the support in general of many of the recent expositors—*Ewald*, *Hirzel*, *De Wette* (Einl. ed. 5 and 6), *Stickel*, *Heiligstedt*, etc. But the discourses of Elihu are conjectured by him to be later than the Babylonish captivity, to which he says there may be a reference in xxxvi. 8. On this point, however, see § 123, IV.]

(8) Comp. especially Jer. xx. 14–18 with Job iii.; also Jer. xx. 7, 8, with Job xii. 4, xix. 7; Jer. xlix. 19 with Job ix. 19; Lam. ii. 16 with Job xvi. 9, 10, xxvii. 23; Lam. iii. 7–9 with Job xix. 7, 8; Lam. iii. 14 with Job xxx. 9; Lam. iii. 15 with Job ix. 18: and on this, *Küper*, Jerem. p. 164 sqq.; *Ewald*, Hiob, p. 3 ff.; *Schlottmann*, p. 107.

(9) Isa. xix. 5 agrees almost word for word with Job xiv. 11; besides, comp. Isa. xix. 13, 14, with Job xii. 24, 25; Isa. lix. 4 with Job xv. 35. There are also manifest allusions in Amos iv. 13 to Job ix. 8, in Amos v. 8 to Job ix. 9 and xxxviii. 31: comp. also Amos

ix. 6 with Job xii. 15; and on this, see *Häv.* p. 353, and *Schlottmann*, p. 109.

(10) Ps. cii., civ., cvii., and cxlvii. contain reminiscences from Job. On the contrary, use has been made of Ps. xxxix. 14 in Job ix. 27, x. 20; of Ps. lviii. 9 in Job iii. 16; of Ps. lxix. 33 in Job xxii. 19; of Ps. ciii. 15 f. in Job vii. 10 and xiv. 2. Comp. *Häv.* p. 356.

(11) The affinity of Job and Proverbs had been already remarked by *Calmet*, dissertt. sur l'écrit. s. ii. p. 168; *Michaelis*, Einl. pp. 92–3; *Rosenmüller*, Schol. p. 35 sqq.; and *Gesenius*, *ut supra:* but a sufficiently critical estimate had not been made. There are many peculiar words and concepts common to the two books, such as עָלַם, Prov. vii. 18, Job xx. 18, xxxix. 13; תַּחְבֻּלוֹת, Job xxxvii. 12, Prov. i. 5, xi. 14, and often; פָּתָה, Job v. 2, Prov. xx. 19; אָכַח, Job xxxiii. 7, Prov. xvi. 26 [in the former a noun, in the latter a verb]; פִּיד, Job xii. 5 and often, Prov. xxiv. 22; רָבָא בְּשָׁעַר, Job v. 4, Prov. xxii. 22; "to drink up iniquity like water," Job xv. 16, xxxiv. 7 [drink scorning], Prov. xxvi. 6 [drink violence]; also אֲבַרּוֹן, Job xxvi. 6 and often, Prov. xv. 11, xxvii. 20 (Ps. lxxxviii. 12); תּוּשִׁיָּה, Job v. 12, vi. 13, and often, Prov. ii. 7, iii. 21, viii. 14, xviii. 1 (elsewhere only Mic. vi. 9, Isa. xxviii. 29). To this class also belong especially the passages Job xv. 7, Prov. viii. 25; Job xxi. 17, and Prov. xiii. 9, xx. 20, xxiv. 20; Job xxviii. 18 and Prov. iii. 15, and others. Comp. *Häv.* pp. 354–5.

(12) Such are the mention of remarkable animals, the hippopotamus, the crocodile, the ostrich (xxx. 29, xxxix. 13 ff.); of costly merchandise (xxviii. 15, 17 ff.), gold of Ophir (xxii. 24, xxviii. 16), pearls or corals (xxviii. 18; comp. Prov. iii. 15, viii. 11, xx. 15, xxxi. 10). Comp. *Häv.* pp. 357–8.

The author was neither a foreigner (13), nor a Hebrew living in Idumea or Egypt (14). He was a member of the theocracy, whose home was in Judah, perhaps born in the mountainous country of southern Judea, familiar with the traditions of early times, and well acquainted with the modes of life and the intercourse of the nations, with the nature of his own country, and (perhaps by travelling) with Egypt also and its wonders. But it is impossible to determine anything more precise as to its personality (15).

(13) The opinions that our book is a translation from an Aramaic or Arabic original (as the addition to the Septuagint says, οὗτος ἑρμηνεύεται ἐκ τῆς Συριακῆς βίβλος [upon which *Bleek*, p. 658,

remarks, that most probably our Hebrew copy is intended by an inexact expression, otherwise it must be regarded as decidedly false]; *Aben Ezra* on Job ii. 11, and others: comp. *Spanheim*, histor. Jobi, cap. 13 sqq., and *Carpzov*, p. 52 sqq.), or that the author was an Idumean (*Herder*, *Ilgen* [see the extract from *Bleek* inserted in Note 1]) or a Nahorite (*Niemeyer*, Characteristik der Bibel, ii. p. 480, and already some older writers in *Heidegger's* Enchiridion, p. 242 sq.), rest upon a total misunderstanding of the subject-matter as well as of the form of the book.

(14) *Eichhorn* (Einl. v. 153–4) held that the author was a Hebrew, who lived in Idumea before the time of Moses, erroneously confounding the home of Job with the poet's fatherland, and misunderstanding the theocratic aim and spirit of the poem. *Hitzig*, again (Jesai. p. 285), and *Hirzel* (Hiob, p. 12), think that he lived in Egypt, on account of the acquaintance with Egyptian objects and relations which he displays; and *Ewald*, p. 322, would have it that at least ch. xl. 15–xli. 26 were composed there. Against this, comp. *Stickel*, p. 263 ff.; *Häv.* p. 333 ff.; and *Schlottmann*, p. 111 ff. [*Bleek*, pp. 660–1, also rejects this notion, and *Bunsen's* conjecture that the individual exile who wrote it was Baruch. He observes that the very astonishment with which behemoth and leviathan are described, is a hint that the writer did not know them so early and so long as a dweller in the land would have done.]

(15) In favour of southern Judea as the home of the author, *Stickel*, p. 276, lays stress especially on the agreement in dialectic peculiarities with those of the prophet Amos, who belonged to Tekoa (namely, מְתָאֵב with א for ע, vi. 8; מְסָרֵף with ס for שׂ, vi. 10; בּוּשָׁם with ש for ם, v. 11; יִשְׁחָק with שׂ for צ, vii. 16); the peculiar character and situation of this border-land, in which the tracks of the caravans of Tema and Sheba crossed one another, and other similar matters, with reference to which *Schlottmann*, p. 112 ff., has attempted more precisely to determine the circumstances of the author's life. [*Bleek*, p. 660, leans to the same opinion, and thinks the absence of any reference to Jerusalem furnishes a presumption that he lived at a distance from the centre of public worship. *Delitzsch*, in his article on Job in *Herzog*, as well as in his more recent Commentary, dwells upon the resemblances in circumstance and in language between the book of Job and Ps. lxxxviii., on account of which he is disposed to assign them to the same author.]

§ 123. *Genuineness and Integrity of the Book.*

Although the book of Job gives such a strong impression of a well-arranged whole, thoroughly rounded off and complete, still misunderstandings of various kinds have led men to mistake about its internal unity and its integrity. This has led them to reject as spurious interpolations, not only the prologue and the epilogue (i., ii., xlii. 7–17), but also various parts of the poem (xxvii. 7–xxviii. 28, xl. 15–xli. 26), but especially the discourses of Elihu (xxxii.–xxxvii.) (1).

(1) This arbitrary kind of criticism is pushed to the uttermost by *Magnus*, p. 8, who not only adds ch. xxviii. to those passages now named as being utterly spurious, but has besides discovered transpositions in twenty-two places, according to his own account.

I. The genuineness of the prologue and the epilogue was assailed on account of their prose form, in which respect they deviate from the principal mass of the book; on account of the use of the name Jehovah, instead of those names which prevail in the poem, Elôah, Shaddai, and El [*Bleek*, p. 654, rejects all notion of this proving a difference of authorship, though he thinks the occurrence of Jehovah in xii. 9 and xxviii. 28 may argue a certain inexactness in the writer's representation]; and on account of certain differences alleged to exist between the prologue and the epilogue on the one hand, and the poem on the other (2). But the prologue and the epilogue are narratives; and prose is the only possible and adequate form in which the subject-matter can be presented. And the distinction in the use of the divine names is to be explained by the intention of the author in the dialogues to select names suitable to the patriarchal times, or usual among those who were not Israelites: whereas, when he is speaking in his own person, he selects the genuine theocratic name Jehovah, not only in the prologue and epilogue, but also in the historical notices interspersed among the discourses, xxxviii. 1, xl. 1, 3, 6, xlii. 1; nay, even once in a discourse of Job's, xii. 9, where there is an allusion to Genesis (3). Then the contradictions which are alleged to exist between the poem and the prologue and epilogue rest upon mere misunderstandings: and the same is to be said of the assertions, that in the poem Job is represented as falling into sin, whereas in the epilogue God acquits him;

that in the poem the mere external doctrine of retribution is combated, whereas it is again treated as valid in the epilogue; and that in the prologue Job's children perish, whereas they appear in the poem to be still alive (4). And the latter part of the assertion, that in the prologue the reason of Job's temptation is set forth as a transaction between God and Satan, whereas in the poem itself it appears to be an insoluble riddle, is unfounded: for the resolution in the court of heaven is hidden only from Job and his opponents, while it is the poet's very intention by means of the prologue to give the reader a glimpse into the complication of matters as occurring in the higher world (5). Without the prologue and the epilogue, the whole poem would become an unintelligible riddle (6).

(2) The view of *R. Simon* (hist. crit. Vet. Test. p. 28) and *Schultens*, followed by *Hasse*, Magazin f. d. bibl. orient. Literatur, i. p. 162 ff.; *Stuhlmann*, p. 23 ff.; *Bernstein; Knobel, l.c.* p. 31 sqq. [*Bleek*, p. 654, adds, in the theol. Studien u. Krit. 1842, 2, pp. 485–495. He says that the opinion of *Carpzov* was that Job himself wrote the speeches, before the time of Moses; and that the prologue and epilogue were written later, by Samuel]; *Magnus*, and others.

(3) See other explanations of this distinction in *Häv.* pp. 344–5.

(4) Comp. *Häv.* p. 362 ff.; *Schlottmann*, p. 37 ff. As regards Job's children, the text ch. xix. 17 is not adopted to prove their continuance in life, because there is a controversy as to its interpretation (comp. *Schröring* in the theol. Studien u. Krit. 1843, p. 995 ff., and see the various meanings attached to it in *Hahn's* Comm.); also because viii. 4 unmistakeably intimates the loss of Job's sons: ch. xxxi. 8 needs to be understood of children just as little as xxix. 5.

(5) The offence taken by critics like *Bernstein* at the miraculous circumstances in the prologue, or in general at the mention of Satan, belong to those dogmatic prejudices which ought not to be taken into account in critical questions. [*Bleek*, p. 655, mentions the opinion of *Heiligstedt* only to reject it, that i. 6–12 and ii. 1–7 are not genuine.] Nor is there any foundation for the opinion of *Herder*, *Eichhorn*, *Stuhlmann*, *Bertholdt*, and *Ewald*, that the Satan of the prologue is different from the Satan of the later books. Against it, see *Schlottmann*, p. 38 ff.

(6) [In this opinion *Bleek* coincides, pp. 654–5.] "Opus ex parte imperfectum habes, meros sermones, quorum causam, rationem, et finem ignoras, exordium et clausulam si demas" (*Rosenmüller*, Schol. p. 46).

II. The suspicion that ch. xxvii. and xxviii. have been misplaced, or that they are spurious, has arisen from a want of insight into the internal arrangement of the poem (7). It has not been understood that what Job says in ch. xxvii. of the judgment impending over the wicked, is only the limitation of what he had said before in delineating the good fortune of the wicked, when in opposition to his friends he had brought forward this side of the subject and given emphasis to it alone, and that thus it meets their misapprehension that he meant to deny a judgment of any kind. At the same time, his delineation in ch. xxviii. of the hidden wisdom of God, shows that the distribution of good and ill fortune among men remained to him an unsolved riddle (8).

(7) Following *Kennicott*, dissert. gener. in Vet. Test. ed. *Bruns*, p. 539 sq., *Eichhorn*, in the allg. Bibliothek d. bibl. Liter. ii. p. 613, *Bertholdt* (Einl. p. 2163), and *Stuhlmann* (exeg. krit. Bemerkk. p. 76 ff.) had attributed ch. xxvii. 13–23 to Zophar (*Stuhlmann* indeed beginning at ver. 11, and also giving ch. xxviii. to Bildad); and *Bernstein*, p. 133 ff., had declared the whole section xxvii. 7–xxviii. 28 to be spurious,—an opinion which *Knobel*, *l.c.* p. 27 sq., restricts to ch. xxviii.; whereas *De Wette*, § 288, lays the burden of indistinctness at least, perhaps also of inconsequential statements, upon the poet.

(8) Comp. *Bouillier*, p. 255 sq.; *Hāv.* pp. 365–6; *Schlottmann*, p. 52.

III. The descriptions of the hippopotamus and crocodile (xl. 15–xli. 26) have been suspected and even pronounced to be later interpolations, as if they were in conflict with the meaning of the second discourse of God, as wanting in connection, and as far removed by their prolixity from the rapidity, delicacy, and easiness of the older descriptions of the animals (9). But this is erroneous. The basis of the two first objections is the error that the first discourse of Jehovah (xxxviii. and xxxix.) is intended to delineate only the divine omnipotence, and the second discourse (xl.) only the divine righteousness; whereas this separation of the divine attributes is foreign to the writer. For, in the first discourse, the intention in delineating God's power is to remonstrate with Job on his folly in striving with God; and then the second discourse aims at displaying to him the audacity of his presumptuous undertaking, to which the question in

xl. 9 obviously refers, and the proof of this is not to be found till we come to the delineation of these mighty colossal animals, ver. 15 ff. That it wants the rapidity and easiness of the preceding sketches of the animals, proves nothing except the skill of the poet, who gives to each of his thoughts and images the corresponding form of representation (10). [*Bleek*, p. 658, takes the same view of the groundlessness of the objections to the passages noticed in this and the preceding paragraph.]

(9) Already *Stuhlmann*, p. 135, and *Bernstein* [to whom *De Wette* is added by *Bleek*, p. 658], pronounced ch. xli. 4–26 to be a foreign element added; while *Eichhorn*, *ibid.* p. 622, and *Bertholdt*, p. 2164, have been content with inserting it behind xl. 31. But more recently, *Eichhorn*, Einl. v. p. 207 ff.; *Ewald*, in the theol. Studien u. Krit. 1829, p. 766 ff. [*Bleek*, p. 658, says in *Zeller's* theol. Jahrbb. 1843, Heft 4, pp. 740–751], and Job, p. 320 ff.; and *E. Meier*, in *Zeller's* theol. Jahrbb. 1844, p. 377, have wished to remove the entire passage xl. 15–xli. 26 as spurious. Against this, comp. *Umbreit*, in the theol. Studien u. Krit. 1831, p. 833 ff.; *Hirzel*, Hiob, p. 260, 2d ed.; *Hāv.* Einl. pp. 367–8; *Hahn*, Hiob, pp. 14, 15.

(10) Comp. *Umbreit*, *ibid.* p. 836; and in reference to linguistic peculiarities brought forward by *Ewald*, comp. *Hirzel*, *ibid.*, and *Hahn*, p. 15.

IV. Also the persistently repeated assaults upon the genuineness of Elihu's discourses are rooted in a defective understanding of their object and their relation to the rest of the poem, as well as of their linguistic character. *a.* It is objected that there is nothing about him either in the prologue or in the epilogue, and that no judgment is pronounced upon his discourses, like that upon those of the three friends. But this objection is of no importance, unless we begin by making two unfounded assumptions: that the aim of the prologue is to introduce all the persons who are to appear in the drama, and that the discourses of Elihu moved simply upon that point on which the friends took their stand. Instead of this, the poet does not introduce the persons till they are to speak or act. Nor is Jehovah named in the prologue as one who is afterwards to appear. Elihu did not belong to the friends of Job, and was not to be placed just beside them: he was not to appear till the three had been over-

come, when he was to show to Job what had been sinful and perverted in his speeches, and to humble his pride (12). Then in the epilogue he could not be reprehended, because he had spoken the simple truth; and a eulogistic memorial of him would have been an offence against the grand simplicity of the whole poem (13). *b.* It is asserted, though erroneously at every point, that Elihu's speeches break the connection between the discourses of Job and of Jehovah, obscure their opposition, anticipate what is said in the latter, and even make them superfluous by giving a solution of the riddle, by putting us in the way of understanding it; whereas the discourses of God demand unconditional submission to His omnipotence and hidden wisdom. But the introduction to Jehovah's discourse, ch. xxxviii., does not assume that Job had spoken immediately before; nor are we to say that the conclusion of Job's discourse, ch. xxxi. 38–40, has been broken off. It is impossible that Elihu can have weakened the effect of the discourses of God, or anticipated their contents; unless his own contain nothing else, and have no object different from those of God, or unless they give a perfect solution of the problem. But, in truth, their whole tendency is to point out to Job the self-humiliation which is wholesome and necessary for man, and to show him that suffering may be a grace as well as a punishment. And thus he prepares the way for the revelation of God, who leads the humbled patriarch fully to see the wrong which he has done by speaking so presumptuously, and then unfolds the dreadful majesty of the Almighty, only to discover His condescending love and grace (14). *c.* Finally, there is the argument taken from the language and diction of Elihu's discourses, which is remarked as being peculiar and different from the other portions. This is deprived of its importance by the following observations:—(*α*) The discourses of the three friends are also distinguished from one another by a decided colouring impressed on the discourse, and in part also by certain favourite expressions. (*β*) Many peculiar expressions and modes of connecting the thoughts, and phrases, and significations of words, which are found in the other portions, recur in this. (*γ*) Its peculiarities consist chiefly in this one thing, that the Aramaisms, which are found in the whole book along with Arabisms, are here somewhat more accumulated; whether this be to mark out Elihu as an Aramæan (xxxii. 2), or whether by these

peculiarities of the style of lofty poetry to make his discourse correspond to his youthful fiery character (15).

(11) Their genuineness has been attacked by *Eichhorn*, allg. Bibliothek, *ibid.* p. 202 ff., and Einl. [4th ed., says *Bleek*, p. 655] p. 202 ff.; *Stuhlmann*, pp. 25 ff., 40 ff.; *Bernstein*, p. 130 ff.; *De Wette*, Einl. § 287; *Knobel*, *l.c.* p. 42 sqq.; *Ewald*, Hiob, p. 296 ff.; *v. Cölln*, bibl. Theol. i. p. 294; *Hirzel*, pp. 198–9; *E. Meier*, in *Zeller's* Jahrbb. 1844, p. 366 ff.; *Heiligstedt*, p. 217 sqq.; *Magnus*, and others. [*Bleek*, p. 655, refers also to a paper of his own in the theol. Studien u. Krit. 1858, 2, p. 368 ff., and expresses his opinion that the balance of probability is against their belonging to the original form of the book. In pp. 657–8 he supposes that they were added to bring out more fully the attitude we ought to assume under suffering at the hand of God; and perhaps also to correct a bad influence from Job's offensive assertions, which were left unrefuted, and might seem rather to be favoured by his justification in the epilogue. To the writer of this portion *Bleek* also attributes the close of xxxi. 40, "The words of Job are ended," inserted so as to distinguish these from his own addition.] On the other hand, they have been defended by *Jahn*, Einl. ii. p. 776 ff.; *Stäudlin*, Beitrr. z. Philos. ii. p. 133 [*Bleek* gives the reference with greater precision, Beitrr. z. Philos. u. Gesch. der Religion u. Sittenlehre, ii. p. 132 ff.]; *Bertholdt*, p. 2158 ff.; *Rosenmüller*, *l.c.* p. 770 sqq.; *Umbreit*, Comm. p. xxv. ff. [*Bleek* adds *Köster*]; *Vaihinger*, Hiob, p. 43 ff.; *Stickel*, Hiob, p. 227 ff.; *Gleiss*, *ibid.* p. 24 ff. [*Bleek* adds *Herbst*]; *Welte*, Hiob, p. 357; *Häv.* p. 369 ff.; *Hahn*, Hiob, p. 15 ff.; *Schlottmann*, p. 58 ff.; *Kosegarten*, and others. [*Bleek* adds *Bunsen*, "in a certain sense."]

(12) In his discourses Job had sinned particularly in three respects:—(1.) To the very last he had impetuously wished for the manifestation of God. (2.) He had denied the perfect revelation of the justice of God in the course of events, and he did this in a manner which was not free from presumption. (3.) He believed himself compelled to assume a want of harmony between the goodness and the power of God. Elihu, in his discourses, convicts him of transgression in these three respects. Comp. *Schlottmann*, pp. 56–7.

(13) Comp. *Schlottmann*, p. 60; and among older writers, *Pareau*, commentat. de immortalitatis ac vitæ futuræ notitiis ab antiquiss. Jobi scriptore, etc., Daventriæ 1807, p. 195; and *Bouillier*, observatt. p. 415 sq.

(14) Comp. *Häv.* p. 370, ff., but especially *Schlottmann*, pp. 58–9, 62–3, and *Oehler*, pp. 25–6.—There is an utter misunderstand-

ing of the object and the contents of these discourses, which makes it impossible to defend their genuineness, if, with *Umbreit*, *Vaihinger*, *Hahn*, and others [*Bleek*, p. 656, adds *Köster*, and *Eichhorn* earlier], we explain Elihu's character as that of an extremely fanciful and presumptuous babbler, who wishes indeed to give a solution of the problem, but fails to do so.

(15) See the proofs in *Stickel*, p. 248 ff., who has taken the greatest pains to throw light upon this argument. The following are the only peculiarities that have been established:—דֵּעַ for דַּעַת, xxxii. 6, 10, 17, xxxvi. 3; נֹעַר for נְעוּרִים, xxxiii. 25, xxxvi. 14; עֻל for עֻלָּה, xxxiv. 10, 32, compared with xxxvi. 23; כֵּנָה, xxxii. 21, 22: and the Hapaxlegomena, אֲבִי, xxxiv. 36; חַף, xxxiii. 9; and אֶבֶף, xxxiii. 7. *De Wette's* reproach, that "its contexts and representations are feeble, prolix, far-fetched, and indistinct," is so much a matter of subjective taste, that there is no need for prolonged discussion on the point. Comp. *Schlottmann*, pp. 61–2; and as to other more unimportant objections, see *Häv.* p. 376 ff. [*Bleek*, p. 657, speaks of the "bombastic and vainglorious tone" in xxxii. 8 ff., 18, xxxvi. 3, etc., which might indeed be explained on the hypothesis (see Note 14) that Elihu was meant to be represented as an idle talker, were this not inadmissible on account of the didactic nature of his discourses. He notices the further peculiarity, that Elihu alone addresses Job by name, xxxiii. 1, 31, xxxvii. 14; comp. xxxii. 12, xxxiv. 5, 7, 35, 36, xxxv. 16: also that repeatedly he quotes the objectionable language of Job to which his reply refers, xxxiii. 8–10, xxxiv. 5, 6, xxxv. 3.]

THE SONG OF SONGS (שִׁיר הַשִּׁירִים).

Commentaries:—*Sal. ben Meir*, Comm. zu Koheleth u. dem Hohenliede, edited by *A. Jellineck*, Leipzig 1855. *Casp. Sanctius. Mercerus*, *Coccejus*, *J. Marckius*, *J. H. Michaelis*, and others; see § 224, 225. See the other numerous older interpreters in *Rosenmüller*, Schol. p. 280 sqq. Mystische Erklär. üb. d. Hohelied Salom., etc., Hamburg and Leipzig 1788. Materials for a new explanation, etc., by *Harmer* (author of the Observations on Scripture), translated from English into German, 1778–9, 2 vols. 4to. *G. A. Ruperti*, Symbolæ ad interpret. S. Cod., vol. i., Fascic. 1, 2, Gottingæ 1792. *Nic. Schyth*, Cant. Cantic. recens versum, comment. exeg. atque crit. illustratum, Havniæ 1797. *J. F. Gaab*, Beitrr. zur Erklärung des sog. Hohen Liedes u. d. Klaglieder, Tübingen 1795. *J. L. Hug*, d. Hohelied in e. noch unversuchten Deutung, Freyburg u. Constanz

1813, 4to; and his defence of his interpretation, 1815, 4to. *J. H. Kistemaker*, Cant. Canticorum illustratum ex hierographia orient., Monasterii 1818. *J. Chr. C. Döpke*, philol. krit. Comment. zum H. Liede Sal., Leipzig 1829. *Rosenmüller*, Schol.; *Heiligstedt*, in *Maurer*, Comm.: see § 224. *Ed. Is. Magnus*, krit. Bearbeitung u. Erklärung des Hohen Liedes Sal., Halle 1842. *Fr. Delitzsch*, d. Hohelied untersucht u. ausgelegt, Leipzig 1851. *E. W. Hengstenberg*, das Hohe lied Sal. ausgelegt., Berlin 1853. *F. Hitzig*, d. Hohelied erklärt, Leipzig 1855 (Lief. 16 of the kurzgefasst. exeg. Handbuch). Translated and explained (by *J. S. Jacobi*), das durch e. leichte u. ungekünstelte Erklärung v. s. Vorwürfen gerettete Hohe Lied, Celle 1771; by *J. G. Herder*, Lieder d. Liebe, Leipzig 1779; by *J. Fr. Kleuker*, Samml. d. Gedichte Sal., Hamm 1780; by *Justi* (Blumen alt-hebr. Dichtkunst), 1807; by *Umbreit*, Göttingen 1820, 2d ed. 1828; by *G. H. A. Ewald*, Göttingen 1826; by *Köster* in *Pelt's* theol. Mitarbeiten, ii. 2, Kiel 1839; by *B. Hirzel*, Zürich 1840; by *H. A. Hahn*, Breslau 1852; by *E. Meier*, Tübingen 1854.

Ern. Fred. Friedrich, Cantici Canticorum Salmonii poetica forma. Dissert., Regiomonte 1855, 4to.

§ 124. *Name and Author.*

The Song of Songs (1) is attributed to Solomon as the author in the superscription, i. 1 (2). This statement is thoroughly confirmed by the predominant circle of imagery in the poem, and by its references to matters of fact (3), as well as by its language (4).

(1) The appellation does not signify one song out of his many songs [as *Aben Ezra* and *Kimchi* render it, says *Bleek*, p. 635]; or a collection of songs (*Kleuker* and others); but "the song of the songs," that is, the most excellent song. Comp. *Gesenius*, Lehrgebäude der hebr. Sprache, p. 692; *Ewald*, Hoheslied, p. 25; *Döpke*, Hoheslied, p. 59 f., and others. [Taking the same view, *Bleek* also rejects an interpretation founded on Chaldee and Arabic usage, "A chain, a series of songs," given by *Velthusen*, and by *Paulus* in *Eichhorn's* Repert. 17, p. 109 f.]

(2) The ל before Solomon's name (i. 1) designates the author, as in the superscriptions of the Psalms; and the אֲשֶׁר is added in consequence of the article in שִׁיר הַשִּׁירִים. [*Bleek*, p. 635, however, follows *Ewald* in translating this word as a plural, not "The song of songs, which is Solomon's," but, "The song of the songs which are

Solomon's," that is, the most precious song of his.] Comp. *Carpzov*, Introd. ii. p. 242 sq., and *Häv.* Einl. iii. pp. 465–6.

(3) The images, i. 5, 9, iii. 7 ff., iv. 4, viii. 11, and others, show that the writer was at home in the age of Solomon. And the multitude of names of plants and animals which occur in it—nuts, aloes, cedar, cypress, vine, mandrakes, rose (חֲבַצֶּלֶת), camphire (כֹּפֶר), frankincense, myrrh, spikenard, cinnamon [pomegranate, etc.], lily, and again, hinds of the field, lions, kids, doves, leopards, mare (סוּסָה), she-goats, young roes, gazelles (צְבָאִים), ewes, foxes (שׁוּעָלִים), turtle—as well as of other natural objects and products (ivory, marble, sapphires, etc.)—favour the belief that he was king Solomon, renowned equally as a prolific composer of songs and as an eminent naturalist (1 Kings v. 12 f.). Comp. *Häv.* p. 469 ff.; *Delitzsch*, Hoheslied, p. 14 ff.; *Hengstb.* Hohesl. p. 228 ff.

(4) Its linguistic stores manifest an affinity with the book of Proverbs. Comp. עֲנָק מִצַּוְּרֹנַיִךְ, iv. 9, with עֲנָקִים לְגַרְגְּרֹתֶיךָ, Prov. i. 9; נֹפֶת תִּטֹּפְנָה שִׂפְתוֹתַיִךְ, iv. 11, with נֹפֶת תִּטֹּפְנָה שִׂפְתֵי זָרָה, Prov. v. 3; נְשִׁיקוֹת, i. 2, and Prov. xxvii. 6; חֲלִי, neck ornament, vii. 2, and Prov. xxv. 12; הוֹלֵךְ לְמֵישָׁרִים, vii. 10, with הִתְהַלֵּךְ בְּמ״, Prov. xxiii. 31; the combination of cinnamon with myrrh and aloes, iv. 14, and Prov. vii. 17. Comp. *Häv.* Einl. i. 1, p. 214 f., and *Hengstenberg's* (Hohesl. pp. 234–5) collection of a whole series of instances in which the books come into contact, some of them very peculiar; thus v. 6 with Prov. i. 28; iv. 12 with Prov. v. 15–18; iv. 5 with Prov. v. 18, 19; viii. 7 with Prov. vi. 30, 31; vii. 3 with Prov. ix. 5; iv. 11 with Prov. xvi. 24; v. 2 with Prov. xx. 13; i. 11 with Prov. xxv. 11 [these last two very general]. And there are others with the book of Job: comp. רִפֵּד, ii. 5, with Job xvii. 13, and רְפִידָה, iii. 10; שָׁזַף, to look upon, i. 6, and Job xx. 9, xxviii. 7 (*Häv.* Einl. i. 1, p. 219): in this he is quite peculiar and original. The Aramaisms, בְּרוֹת with ת for שׁ, נָטַר with ט for צ: סְתָו, ii. 11, like the unusual forms, שִׂפְתוֹת for שִׂפְתֵי; מִדְבָּר for פֶּה (iv. 3); גַּנִּים, iv. 15, vi. 2, viii. 13, for גַּנּוֹת; רַעְיָה for רֵעָה, i. 9, 15, ii. 2, and often; שֶׁ for אֲשֶׁר,—are to be explained by the highly poetical character of the composition, or, according to *Hengstb.* Hohesl. p. 237, by Solomon's cosmopolitan tendencies. A Persian origin can as little be argued from פַּרְדֵּס, iv. 13, as a Greek origin from אַפִּרְיוֹן, iii. 9; comp. *Delitzsch*, Hohesl. pp. 22–3. Against the uncritical judgments pronounced on the language of this book by *Eichhorn*, *Bertholdt*, *Umbreit*, *Rosenmüller*, *Kaiser*, and especially *Hartmann* (in *Winer's* Zeitschrift, i. 3, pp. 420–1), *Köster* (in *Pelt's* Mitarbeiten, ii. 2, p. 29 ff.), *Magnus*, and others, comp. *Ewald*, Hohesl. p. 16 ff.; *Döpke*, Hohesl. p. 28 ff.; *Häv.* Einl. i. 1, p. 213 ff., and iii. p. 465 ff.; *Delitzsch*,

Hohes. p. 20 ff.; and *Hengstb.* Hohesl. p. 236 f. The last-named writer observes, p. 237: "It is clear that the writer is in no way dependent on the Aramaizing *usus loquendi* of the later age, but that rather he rests everything on his purpose and his free choice. For, 1*st*, except the *v*, scarcely anything occurs which reappears in that later usage; rather, anything foreign is exclusively peculiar to the Song of Songs. 2*d*, The language has a youthful freshness, unknown to any production of the age of debased Hebraism."

The doubts as to its composition by Solomon have arisen partly from a want of correct understanding, and from other untenable assumptions; partly from incorrect judgments passed upon its linguistic character. They are therefore insufficient to justify us in rejecting the superscription as spurious and erroneous (5).

(5) On account of the language, *Eichhorn*, *Bertholdt*, and *Rosenmüller* place the Song of Songs in the Persian age; *Hartmann* makes it still later.—A false conception of the idea in the poem, and other misapprehensions, have led *Ewald*, *Köster*, *Magnus*, *Hirzel*, *Döpke*, *Hitzig*, and others, to deny that Solomon is the author: whereas the affirmative is maintained by *Hofmann*, Weissagung u. Erfüllung, i. p. 189; *Delitzsch*, p. 14 ff.; *Hengstb.* p. 228 ff. [*Bleek*, p. 639 f., thinks it improbable that Solomon was the author, though he thinks that it is all by a single writer, and that he belonged to the age of Solomon.]

§ 125. *Contents and Object of the Book.*

The Song of Songs does not consist of a collection of amatory idyllic songs (1), but it is a poem with an internal unity (2). Yet it is not a drama representing the victory of faithful love, or the reward of fidelity (3); nor yet an epithalamium composed on the occasion of Solomon's marriage with an Egyptian princess, or with an Israelite bride distinguished for beauty and virtue (4); nor is it a poetically idealized representation of an attachment which Solomon had himself experienced, which is made the means of unfolding dramatically the idea or the mystery of marriage as the pattern and type of the union between the Lord and His Church (5). Rather it depicts in dramatico-lyrical responsive songs, under the allegory of the bridal love of Solomon and Shulamith, the loving communion between the Lord and His Church, according to its ideal nature as it results from the choice of

Israel to be the Church of the Lord. According to this, every disturbance of that fellowship, springing out of Israel's infidelity, leads to an ever firmer establishment of the covenant of love, by means of Israel's return to the true covenant God, and this God's unchangeable love. Yet we are not to trace in the poem the historical course of the covenant relation, as if a veil of allegory had been thrown over the principal critical events in the theocratic history (6).

(1) So [among the Fathers, *Theodore of Mopsuestia;* among the Reformers, *Castellio;* afterwards, *Grotius*, *Episcopius*, *Clericus*, at least as regarded the immediate or nearest meaning: so says *Bleek*, p. 638, he himself being strongly of the same opinion;] *R. Simon*, hist. crit. Vet. Test. i. c. 4, p. 28; *J. D. Michaelis*, nott. ad *R. Lowthii*, de sacr. poesi Hebr. præl. xxx., and in the neue orient. Biblioth. iv. p. 82 ff.; *Herder; Hufnagel*, in *Eichhorn's* Repert. vii. 199 ff.; *Döderlein*, Auctor. ad *Hugonis Grotii*, annotatt. in Vet. Test. p. 189 sqq.; *Kleuker; Paulus*, in *Eichhorn*, Repert. xvii. 108 ff.; *Eichhorn*, Einl. v. p. 230; *Gaab*, Beittr.; *Jahn*, Einl. ii. p. 816 f.; *Pareau*, institut. interpr. Vet. Test. p. 559; *Döpke*, *De Wette* (Einl.), *Hartmann*, *Magnus*, and *Heiligstedt.*

(2) The unity and the integrity of the book have been assailed especially by *Magnus.* But in favour of these there is the testimony— *a.* Of the superscription, "The Song of Songs," which designates the poetry that follows as one internally united whole. *b.* Of the resemblance of the contents and of the subject from first to last. *c.* Of the designations of the persons, which remain the same throughout the entire book. Besides the name of Solomon, i. 5, iii. 7, 9, 11, viii. 11, and the "daughters of Jerusalem," i. 5, ii. 7, iii. 5, v. 8, 16, viii. 4, compare the designation of him who is beloved by דּוֹדִי, i. 13, 14, 16, ii. 3, 8–10, 16, 17, iv. 16, v. 2–6 [more precisely v. 2, 4–6], 8, 10, 16, vi. 2, 3, vii. 10–12, 14, viii. 14, or שֶׁאַהֲבָה נַפְשִׁי, i. 7, iii. 1–4; and of her who is loved by בַּלָּה, iv. 8, or אֲחֹתִי בַּלָּה, iv. 9, 10, 12, v. 1, or רַעְיָתִי, i. 9, 15, ii. 2, 10, 13, iv. 1, 7, v. 2, vi. 4, or יְפָתִי רַעְיָתִי, ii. 10, 13, comp. v. 2, vi. 9, or הַיָּפָה בַּנָּשִׁים, i. 8, v. 9, vi. 1. *d.* Of a number of peculiar expressions, images, and turns of expression which recur in similar proportions through all the parts of the poem. Such are שֶׁל, i. 6, iii. 7, viii. 12; רַעְיָתִי for רֵעָה (see above); כֹּפֶר, *κύπρος*, i. 14, iv. 13, vii. 12 [these last two are plural; the last may be "villages," as in the Eng. version]; עֹפֶר הָאֵילִים, ii. 9, 17, viii. 14; עֲפָרִים תְּאַמֵּי צְבִיָּה, iv. 5, vii. 4 [in the latter it is תְּאַמֵּי]; סְמַדַּר, ii. 13, 15, vii. 13; יוֹנָתִי, ii. 14, v. 2, vi. 9; מִי זֹאת וגו׳, iii. 6, vi. 10, viii. 5; הַרֹּעֶה בַּשּׁוֹשַׁנִּים, ii. 16, iv. 5, vi. 3,

and שִׁשִּׁים in other biblical applications, ii. 1, 2 [in both these it is the singular feminine form], v. 13, vi. 2, vii. 3. *e.* The recurrence of whole sentences, which is not to be traced to imitation, i. 15, iv. 1, comp. v. 12 and vi. 4; further, ii. 5 and v. 8, ii. 6 and viii. 3, ii. 17 and iv. 6, comp. also ii. 17 and viii. 14: and the recurring verses, ii. 16, vi. 3, comp. vii. 11; and ii. 7, iii. 5, viii. 4, comp. v. 8. Comp. *Häv.* Einl. iii. pp. 484–5; *Delitzsch*, p. 4 ff.; *Hahn*, Hohesl. p. 14 f.; and *Hengstb.* p. 223 ff.

(3) So, yet with manifold varieties in the conception of the details, *Jacobi*, *Hezel* (neue Uebersetz. u. Erklärung des Hohen Liedes, 1777), *Ammon* (Salomo's verschmähte Liebe, od. die belohnte Treue, 1790), *Stäudlin* (in *Paulus'* Memorab. St. 2), *Lindemann* (in *Keil* u. *Tzschirner's* Analekt. iii. 1), *Umbreit* (d. Lied der Liebe, 1820, and, Erinnerung a. d. Hohe Lied, 1839), *Ewald*, *Köster*, *Hirzel*, *Meier*, *Hitzig*, and *Böttcher* (exeget. krit. Aehrenlese z. Alten Test., Leipzig 1849, pp. 80–1, and, die ältesten Bühnendichtungen, Leipzig 1850), who calls it "the text of an opera, a national drama which originated in the kingdom of Israel about B.C. 950, against the royal house of Solomon, and its custom of having a harem, to the danger of the family life; performed with acting and short impromptu speeches, in the same manner as Indian, Chinese, and ancient Italian (Atellanic) dramas!". In opposition to this, comp. my remarks in *Häv.* Einl. p. 487 ff.; *Nägelsbach*, in *Reuter's* Repertorium, 1851, vol. xxvi. p. 1 ff.; and *Delitzsch*, p. 30 ff.

(4) Maintained by *Grotius* (comp. *Häv.* Einl. p. 481), who is followed by *Bossuet*, *Harmer*, *Köster*, *Hofmann*. This last writer finds in it a mirror-like reference (not so much in the way of a type as in the way of the history of salvation) to the rest and satisfaction to which the history of Israel since the exodus had attained in the days of Solomon. Against him, comp. *Delitzsch*, p. 36 ff.

(5) *Delitzsch* and *Nägelsbach*, *ibid.* This is an attempt, genially executed by *Delitzsch*, to give a conception of the Song of Songs with a reference to the history of the time. According to it, "without Solomon's conscious aim, by the agency of the Holy Spirit, it has taken such a form, that the mystery of marriage sheds its rays upon us out of its ethereal love, its crystal mirror" (*Delitzsch*, p. 235). Yet even this theory does not do full justice to the contents of the poem: and not to speak of other reasons, it is wrecked upon passages such as iii. 6 ff., iv. 8, vi. 4, 10, and others; for the literal acceptation of which, as in the sense of an earthly bride and a consort of Solomon's, the boldest oriental poetry offers no corresponding parallels.

(6) The allegorical acceptation was not only always the predominant one in the synagogue and in the Christian Church, so that the sensuous interpretation attempted by *Theodore of Mopsuestia*, and renewed at a later time by *Castellio*, was rejected as heretical (comp. *Häv.* Einl. p. 474 ff.; *Delitzsch*, p. 47 ff.; and *Hengstb.* p. 254 ff.); but it is also a necessary corollary from the reception of the book into the Canon. [*Castellio* therefore denied it a place in the Canon, on account of which he was banished from Geneva 1544, says *Bleek*, p. 638.] The foundation of this allegory is already contained in the Pentateuch, which uses the figurative expression, "to go a-whoring after" other gods, to represent Israel's apostasy from the Lord, Ex. xxxiv. 15, 16, Lev. xx. 5, 6, comp. with xvii. 7, Num. xiv. 33; and its living hold of the popular mind is taken for granted in the way of looking at Jehovah's relation to His people under the image or allegory of marriage, in Deut. xxxii. 16, 21, Ex. xx. 5. And this comprehends the germs which were multifariously unfolded at a later time by the prophets, whose representations point back to the Pentateuch and the Song of Songs. Comp. *Hengstb.* Beitrr. ii. p. 48 ff., and Hoheslied, p. 252 f. *Delitzsch*, pp. 63–4, reckons it an argument against understanding the Song of Songs allegorically, that we should then meet with that idea unfolded to the utmost in this poem of the age of Solomon without any intermediate links; but there are two replies which deprive his objection of its force. First, we meet with the germs of many ideas in the Pentateuch which are fully unfolded in the psalms of David's age and in the Proverbs (for instance, the idea of Wisdom), yet without intermediate links along which to trace their gradual formation. And secondly, Ps. lxxii. and xlv., of the age of Solomon, show a similar progress in unfolding the Messianic idea: and this also is rendered conceivable by the composition in that age of the Song of Songs (comp. *Hengstb.* Hohesl. pp. 238 ff., pp. 250–1), which brings us to look at the loving fellowship between the Lord and His Church according to the divine idea, and not according to the naked historical facts,—thus showing itself to be Messianic, and delineating a relation which is first realized in Christ.—Still less can the personality of Solomon, and the character of his age and of the writings belonging to it, be in contradiction to our understanding the Song of Songs as a prophetic allegory (as *Delitzsch*, p. 65, asserts), if the prophetic Ps. lxxii. is a composition of Solomon's, which *Delitzsch* himself acknowledges. The Song of Songs is not a product which has grown up in the soil of the natural development of the theocratic consciousness of God: like the prophetic psalms, it was begotten in the soul of Solomon by the super-

natural agency of the Holy Spirit, in such a form that the mutual love of king Solomon and the ideal Shulamith [the feminine form in Hebrew, which answers to the masculine Solomon] became glorified into an allegory of the marriage of the heavenly Bridegroom with His chosen bride on earth.—The remaining objections to understanding it allegorically are refuted by *Häv.* Einl. p. 495 ff. This view has been defended in the most recent times by *Rosenmüller*, Analekten i. 3, p. 141 ff., in the Evang. Kirchen Zeitung, 1827, Nr. 23 f.; by *Kistemaker;* by *Welte* on *Herbst's* Einl. ii. 2, p. 238 ff.; by *Scholz*, Einl. iii. p. 130 ff.; by *O. v. Gerlach* in his Bibelwerk; and lastly, by *Hengstb.* in his Commentary.—Other untenable allegorical interpretations have been attempted by *Rosenmüller* in his Scholia, where by Shulamith he understands Wisdom, with *Abarbanel* and *Leo Hebræus* (comp. *Delitzsch*, p. 65 ff.); by *Hug*, who explains the Song of Songs as a poetic dream,—Solomon, Shulamith, and her love, being intended to represent respectively king Hezekiah, the people of the Ten Tribes, and their longing to be re-united to this king; by *Kaiser*, The Song of Songs, a collection of songs relating to Zerubbabel, Ezra, and Nehemiah, as the restorers of a Jewish constitution in the province of Judah, Erlangen 1825; and by *H. Aug. Hahn*, who finds this thought carried out allegorically in the Song of Songs, "that the kingdom of Israel is called in the service of God finally to overcome heathendom with the weapons of love and righteousness, and to lead it back to the peaceful rest of loving fellowship with Israel, and so with God again."

The plan and the execution of the fundamental idea are maintained in a dramatic manner, yet not in such a way as to form a drama with ever advancing action. The whole is divided into two parts, which correspond in many ways (i. 1–v. 1, and v. 2–viii. 14); and each of these falls into three connected sections. And there is a progress in the delineation of the longing of the bride to be united to her lover; so that the separation after the first union only inflames love the more violently, and introduces a firm covenant established with inviolable fidelity (7).

(7) The six sections delineate—I. The longings of mutual love (i. 2–ii. 7); II. The lovers seeking and finding one another (ii. 8–iii. 5); III. The nuptials (iii. 6–v. 1); IV. The separation and re-union (v. 2–vi. 9); V. The praises of the lovers (vi. 10–viii. 4); VI. The confirmation of the covenant of love leading to inviolable fidelity

(viii. 5–14). Comp. *Häv.* Einl. p. 500 ff.—According to *Hengstb.*, each of the principal divisions is subdivided into five, so that the number ten dominates over the whole poem. [*Bleek*, p. 640, gives *Delitzsch's* division, the same as *Keil's*, though the headings are somewhat fuller; thus: "III. The bringing in of the bride, and the marriage; IV. Love slighted, yet recovered; V. How Shulamith, who is enchantingly beautiful, preserved her simplicity and humility even when she became a princess; VI. Visit of Solomon and Shulamith to the home of the latter, and confirmation of their covenant of love." Yet his own opinion is, that even *Delitzsch's* interpretation, which he considers much the best of those which uphold the unity of the book, presents many difficulties and improbabilities: for instance, he is driven to the hypothesis that iii. 1–5 and v. 2–7 are dreams of Shulamith's, since they could scarcely be actual occurrences in the life of Solomon. Many passages also are unsuitable to the condition of Solomon and of a king's bride, he says—i. 7, 8, 12 ff., 17, ii. 16, vi. 8, 9; and Solomon can hardly be thought to be writing of himself, v. 9–16 and iii. 6–11.]

LAMENTATIONS (אֵיכָה).

Commentaries:—*Calvin*, *Bugenhagen*, *V. Strigel*, *Selneccer*, *Tarnovius*, *Chr. Ben. Michaelis* in *J. H. Michaelis*, uberior. annotatt. vol. ii., *Rosenmüller*, *Maurer*; see § 224. *J. Th. Lessing*, Observatt. in Tristia Jer., Lipsiæ 1770. Threni Jer. philol. et crit. illustrati a *J. H. Pareau*, Lugduni Batavorum 1790. Caræ exeg. et crit. in Thren. Jer., auctore *J. Fr. Schleussner*, in *Eichhorn's* Repert. xii. *C. A. H. Kalkar*, Lamentatt. crit. et exeg. illustratæ, Hafniæ 1836. Translated, with remarks, by *Riegler*, Erlangen 1814: *Conz* in *Bengel's* Archiv iv.; *Goldwitzer*, with a comparison of the Septuagint and Vulgate, and with critical remarks, 1828. *Wiedenfeld*, Elberfeld 1830; *Ewald*, poet. Bucher, vol. i. *O. Thenius*, die Klaglieder erklärt, Leipzig 1855 (Lief. 16 of the kurzgefasst. exeg. Handbuch). *Vaihinger*; see among the works on Proverbs. [*Neumann* on Lamentations, in his Commentary on Jeremiah.]

§ 126. *Name, Contents, and Form.*

The superscription אֵיכָה, taken from the characteristic first word, is borne by those five lyric poems, imitations of the ancient elegies over the dead (2 Sam. i. 17, 18, iii. 33; 2 Chron. xxxv. 25) (1),

called קינות by the Rabbins, *Θρῆνοι* in the Septuagint, and "Threni" or "Lamentations" in the Vulgate, which were composed on the overthrow of the kingdom of Judah (2). They lament the land laid waste, the people carried captive, Jerusalem and the temple plundered and destroyed, and the unutterable misery which broke upon the covenant people in connection with this catastrophe (3).

(1) That very ancient practice of singing lamentations over the beloved dead gave occasion, even at an early period, to lamentations on account of calamities which befell lands, cities, and nations. Comp. Amos v. 1; Jer. vii. 29, ix. 2, 29; Ezek. xix. 1, xxvi. 17, xxvii. 2; and upon these, *Hāv.* Einl. iii. p. 507.

(2) Against the interpretation which refers them to the death of Josiah, in [*Josephus*, as *Bleek* observes, p. 504] *Jerome*, comm. ad Zech. xii. 11; *Michaelis*, ad *Lowthii* de sacr. poesi Hebr. p. 457, and Anm. zur Uebersetzung der Klagelieder (though he takes another view in neu. orient. Biblioth. i. 106); *Dathe*, proph. major. ed. 1 (though another view in ed. 2), comp. *Carpzov*, Introd. iii. p. 181 sqq.; and *Eichhorn*, Einl. v. § 562. *De Wette*, § 272, arbitrarily refers the notice in 2 Chron. xxxv. 25 to our Lamentations: against this, comp. *Kalkar*, p. 43, and *Thenius*, p. 115 f. [The opinion of *Keil* is also that of *Bleek*, p. 504: he believes that the collection of elegies on Josiah, composed partly by Jeremiah, has perished like many other non-canonical books quoted in Chronicles.]

(3) This is the common subject of all the five elegies. Yet there is so far a division, that certain topics predominate: in the *first*, lamentation on account of the captivity of the people and the oppression connected with the taking of Jerusalem; in the *second*, terror at the demolition and burning of the city and temple; while in the *third*, the spiritual sufferings and the leadings of the godly men are set forth to the people as an exhortation to repentance, and a ground of hope of deliverance; in the *fourth*, God's punitive justice is unfolded, as it manifested itself in the calamity; and in the *fifth* there is prayer that the previous gracious relation may be restored.—On the other hand, there is no foundation for the reference of the individual chapters to various events in that catastrophe, in which the Chaldeans were the agents: against this view of *Horrer*, *Pareau*, *Jahn*, and others, comp. *Hāv.* p. 511 f.

In order to give a character of completeness and well-connected discourse to this lamentation, which ever advances in new words,

images, and turns of expression, all these poems, except the last, are arranged alphabetically (4), in the following manner:—The *first two* consist of long verses, each of three lines; and the lines are, as a general rule, divided unequally by a cæsura. In the *third* the alphabetical structure extends even to the lines, so that every verse begins three times with the same letter in its proper order; hence the Masorètes have divided every verse into three [that is to say, as the verses are numbered in our Bibles]. The *fourth* moves forward in long verses of two lines, with a cæsura (5). In the *fifth* the lamentation resolves itself into a prayer, and reflection gives way before the natural unrestrained outburst of the emotions; and on this account the alphabetical structure is abandoned, and the letters of the alphabet have had no other influence than this, that their number determines the number of the verses, which are short, and of two lines each (6).

(4) As to this reason, which arises from the very nature of the case, comp. my remarks in *Häv.* Einl. p. 513 f.

(5) Yet the alphabetical form is here and there interrupted. Not only is the length of the lines sometimes very unequal (comp. *Pareau*, Thren. p. 53 sqq.); but also in i. 7 and ii. 19 we meet with verses of four lines in the middle of those with three; and in ch. ii., iii., and iv., the ב verses precede the ע verses. These are deviations not to be removed by arbitrary emendations of the text, but to be explained by this, that the poet was strictly restrained by the external form only so long as it was adapted to the thought without over-refinement. Comp. *Häv.* p. 512 f.

(6) *Bertholdt*, p. 2320, and *Ewald*, seek for an entirely external explanation of the want of the alphabetical structure in the fifth poem; namely, that the author was hindered by an accident from giving the last touch to it.

§ 127. *The Author and the Date of Composition.*

Tradition names the prophet Jeremiah as the author (1). This is perfectly in harmony with the contents of these poems, their spirit, and their language; for the poet depicts the fearful judgment which fell upon Jerusalem and Judah, not only as if he were an eye-witness (2), but also in the spirit of this prophet (3), and in his manner and language (4). The composition of the individual poems did not take place at different times (5), but one immediately after

another, and all five soon after the destruction of Jerusalem; since they stand internally and organically related, and bear the stamp of the freshest and liveliest recollection of the terror inspired by this astounding catastrophe (6).

(1) Septuagint, Lam. i. 1: *Καὶ ἐγένετο μετὰ τὸ αἰχμαλωτισθῆναι τὸν Ἰσραὴλ καὶ Ἰερουσαλὴμ ἐρημωθῆναι, ἐκάθισεν Ἱερεμίας κλαίων, καὶ ἐθρήνησε τὸν θρῆνον τοῦτον ἐπὶ Ἰερουσαλὴμ, καὶ εἶπε.* Comp. *Origen*, in *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccl. iv. 25; *Jerome*, in prol. galeat.; and *Talmud*, baba bathr. f. 15, 1. [Though *Josephus*, Antiq. x. 5, 1, erred in regard to the subject of the book, as already noticed in the addition to § 126, Note 2, yet *Bleek* observes, p. 502, he must have meant our present book, for he says it continued in existence in his day; and he also ascribes it to Jeremiah.]

(2) In fact, as one who had shared in the severest experiences and sufferings, ii. 11, ch. iii., comp. with Jer. xv. 15 ff., xvii. 13 ff., xx. 7, 8; especially iii. 14 comp. with Jer. xx. 7, iii. 64–66 with Jer. xvii. 18; and further, iv. 17–20, and the whole of ch. v.

(3) Here, as in the prophecies of Jeremiah, the misdeeds and heavy guilt of the covenant people are named as the causes of the banishment of the people, and of the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple (comp. i. 5, 8, 14, 22, iii. 39, 42, iv. 6, 22, v. 16, with Jer. xiii. 22, 26, xiv. 7, xvi. 10 ff., xvii. 1 ff.): as also their sinful confidence in false prophets and dissolute priests (comp. ii. 14, iv. 13–15, with Jer. ii. 7, 8, v. 31, xiv. 13, xxiii. 11 ff., xxvii., etc.); their mistaken reliance on safety in Jerusalem (comp. iv. 12 with Jer. vii. 4–15); their vain hope of assistance from powerless and faithless allies (comp. i. 2, 19, iv. 17, with Jer. ii. 18, 36, xxx. 14, xxxvii. 5–10). *Häv.* Einl. p. 515.

(4) In common with the prophecies of Jeremiah, the Lamentations constantly go back upon the utterances of the law (comp. *Küper*, Jerem. pp. 45–47), are negligent in their style, are monotonous, and frequently repeat the same thoughts and images. Of this, *Pareau*, in the observatt. generalior. which precede his Commentary, § 6–8, gives a multitude of proofs. And there are a great many other characteristic words and turns of expression: for instance, מְגוּרַי מִסָּבִיב, ii. 22, comp. the singular in Jer. vi. 25, xx. 3, 10, xlvi. 5, xlix. 29; the frequent use of שָׁבָר, alone or followed by בַּת עַמִּי, ii. 11, 13, iii. 47, 48, iv. 10, comp. Jer. iv. 6, 20, vi. 1, 14, viii. 11, 21, xiv. 17, xxx. 12, and often; of יָרַד with מַיִם or דִּמְעָה, i. 16, ii. 11, 18, iii. 48 f. [?], comp. Jer. viii. 23, ix. 17, xiii. 17, xiv. 17: finally, comp. passages like iii. 14 with Jer. xx. 7; iii. 15 with Jer. ix. 14 and xxiii. 15;

iii. 47 with Jer. xlviii. 43; iii. 52 with Jer. xvi. 16; iv. 21 with Jer. xxv. 15, 27; and i. 8, 9, with Jer. xiii. 21, 26. Alongside of all this only a few peculiar words are found, as נִשְׂקַד, i. 14; יָעִיב, ii. 1; שָׂחַם, iii. 8; כָּפַשׁ [*Hiphil*], iii. 16; צָפַד, iv. 8; תַּאֲלָה and מְגִנַּת לֵב, iii. 65: and peculiar formations, like מִשְׁבָּת, i. 7; מַדּוּחִים, ii. 14; פּוּגָה, ii. 18, iii. 49, and others.

(5) *Pareau's* attempt, p. 50, to determine the origin of the five poems with reference to certain individual events, is refuted in *Häv.* Einl. p. 518.

(6) [*Bleek*, pp. 503, 504, thinks we may even be so precise as to say with probability that they were composed in that month which elapsed between the capture and the destruction of the city,—a month which Jeremiah did spend in Jerusalem, Jer. xxxix. 14. He appeals to passages which seem to speak of the temple as still standing, i. 2, 4, 16, 19, ii. 6 ff., 10 ff., 19 ff., iv. 1, 5, 18, v. 11, 14; and of frightful famine and want still reigning in the city, i. 11, 19 f., ii. 19, 20, iv. 3–5, 9, 10, etc. At p. 502 he says that the doubts whether Jeremiah wrote these poems have been only in recent times, and have not been frequent. He names *Herm. van der Haardt* in a Helmstädt programme of 1712, and for some others refers to *Keil* in the continuation of *Häv.* Einl. iii. 517 f.] According to *Ewald*, Gesch. d. Volks Israel, iv. p. 22 ff., the poems were composed, not long after the destruction of Jerusalem, in Egypt (?); and if not by Jeremiah himself, at all events by one of his disciples, whose native place had been Jerusalem. On the contrary, *O. Thenius* (Klagel. p. 120 ff.) would make only ch. ii. and iv. proceed from Jeremiah; the former, while still in Palestine, immediately after the destruction of Jerusalem, and the latter afterwards, probably in Egypt. He will have it that the other three poems were composed in the land in which the contemporaries and fellow-citizens of the prophet remained behind. His reasons are mostly æsthetic: *Ewald*, bibl. Jahrb. vii. p. 151 f., rightly pronounces them "altogether unimportant, and in fact incorrect;" and to some extent he goes into a refutation of them.

ECCLESIASTES, OR THE PREACHER (קֹהֶלֶת).

Commentaries:—*M. Bucer*, *Mercerus*. *Brentius*, *V. Strigel*, *M. Geier*, *Seb. Schmidt*, *Rambach* in *J. H. Michaelis*, uberior. annotatt., *Rosenmüller*, *Heiligstedt* in *Maurer's* Comm.; see § 224. Ecclesiastes philol. et. crit. illustr. a. *J. H. van der Palm*, Lugduni Batavorum 1784. *Kaiser*, Koheleth d. Collectivum der David. Könige zu Jeru-

salem, Erlangen 1823. *A. Knobel*, Comm. üb. d. B. Koheleth, Leipzig 1836. *F. Hitzig*, d. Prediger Salomo's erklärt, Leipzig 1847 (Lief. 7 of the kurzgefasst. exeg. Handbuch). *Burger*, Comm. in Ecclesiasten, Drusib. 1854 (unimportant). *Ern. Elster*, Comm. üb. d. Pred. Salomo, Göttingen 1855. *Lud. v. Essen*, d. Prediger Salomo's, Schafhausen 1856. Translations and explanations, by *Kleuker*, Leipzig 1777; *Döderlein*, Nürnberg, 2d ed. 1792; *G. Lebr. Spohn*, Leipzig 1785; *G. Zirkel*, Würzburg 1792 (and, Unterss. üb. d. Prediger nebst krit. u. philol. Bemerkk., at the same place); *J. E. Ch. Schmidt*, Giessen 1794; *J. Ch. C. Nachtigal*, Halle 1798; *Umbreit* (Koheleth des weisen Königs Seelenkampf, od. philos. Betrachtt. üb. d. höchste Gut), Gotha 1818; *Köster* (along with Job), 1831; *Ewald*, poett. Bücher, vol. iv. 1837 [and later editions. *C. D. Ginsburgh*, Coheleth, or the Book of Ecclesiastes, London 1861].

J. F. Winzer, Commentat. de loco Koheleth xi. 9–xii. 7, Lipsiæ 1818–19, 3 Progr., 4to.

§ 128. *Name and Character of the Book.*

According to the superscription, "The words of Koheleth, the son of David, king in Jerusalem" (i. 1), Koheleth should be a surname of king Solomon, who is introduced speaking in the book (1). Consequently, though this word has been explained in many ways, yet it signifies neither a collector, *συναθροιστής*, nor an assembly or academy, nor Wisdom preaching; but the speaker in an assembly, *ὁ Ἐκκλησιαστής* (Septuagint), Ecclesiastes (Vulgate) (2).

(1) The feminine form of the word is the abstract designation of an office, then transferred to the person clothed with that official dignity, like סֹפֶרֶת, scribe, Neh. vii. 57; פֹּכֶרֶת, Ezra ii. 57, and others. [*Bleek*, p. 641, holds the same opinion as *Keil*; yet admits that these two examples are insufficient, since in both cases they are actual proper names.] Comp. *Gesenius*, Lehrgebäude d. hebr. Sprache, pp. 468 and 877; *Knobel*, Comm. p. 8 ff. The name is symbolically significant, designating the function assigned to Solomon in the book, like Ariel in Isa. xxix. 1, 2; Sheshach, Jer. xxv. 26.

(2) "'Εκκλησιαστής Græco sermone appellatur qui coetum, *i.e.* ecclesiam congregat: quem nos nuncupare possumus *concionatorem*, eo quod loquatur ad populum et ejus sermo non specialiter ad unum sed ad universos generaliter dirigatur," says *Jerome* [ad. Eccl. i. 1]. Against the interpretation *συναθροιστής*, "Collector" (*Grotius, Her-*

der, *Jahn*), there is not only the nature of the contents of the book, since it contains no mere collection of opinions and sayings, but also the usage of the language; for the verb means, to assemble (not things, but) persons, to call them together: see *Carpzov*, ii. p. 202. The interpretations "Assembly" (*Döderlein*, *Nachtigal*, *Bertholdt*, and others) and "Preaching Wisdom" (*M. Geier*, *Rambach*, *Köster*, *Ewald*, and *Hitzig*) suit neither the superscription, i. 1, nor such passages as i. 12, xii. 9, 10. See some other inadmissible interpretations in *Carpzov*, p. 200; in *Häv.* Einl. iii. p. 434 f.; and in *Elster*, Comm. p. 1 ff.

In respect of its character, the book attaches itself to the Solomonic composition of proverbs. Yet it does not give isolated wise utterances, but it unfolds a firmly and well-defined circle of thoughts and truths in a form at once poetical and rhetorical. This is so managed, that either one experience and observation is set over against another, advancing dialectically; or else, that apophthegms and sentences alternate with the presentation of contemplations upon various human relations and endeavours; or there is the like interchange of maxims with delineations of circumstances (3). The form of the book, at once poetical and rhetorical, shows itself in the whole arrangement, according to which the entire body of truth which is to be set forth is divided into four discourses, in which the principal and fundamental thought contemplated at the time is ever illustrated and unfolded from some new side; and also in the strophical division of the special contents of the individual discourses, and in the interchange of rhythmical prose and rhetorico-poetic diction in the discourse, corresponding to the manifold objects which are to be set forth (4).

(3) The author himself names his teaching מְשָׁלִים, xii. 9; and he also often sets it forth in apophthegms and proverbs. Comp. *Häv.* Einl. pp. 444–5.

(4) The strophical arrangement is marked partly by recurring formulas, ii. 15, 19, 23, viii. 10, 14, or i. 14, ii. 11, comp. ii. 26 and iv. 16, or ii. 1, iii. 18, and the like; yet also frequently by nothing more than new turns of thought. Comp. *Vaihinger*, in the theol. Studien u. Krit. 1848, p. 473 ff.

§ 129. *Contents, Plan, and Aim.*

The Preacher treats of the vanity of all earthly affairs and endeavours; and on the ground of this experience, which seems to conflict with faith in an unchangeably holy, good, and righteous regulation of the world and its affairs, he teaches how to live happily, or to have the true enjoyment of life coupled with contentment and godliness (1). Yet this is not in an Epicurean sense: it is to be a religious and moral endeavour, receiving thankfully all the good things of this life as the gift of God, and enjoying them happily in the constant remembrance of the judgment awaiting us all, and engaging busily in keeping up the fear of God and works of charity and piety (ii. 24, iii. 13, 17, iv. 17, v. 1–6, 18, viii. 14, xi. 1, 2, 9, xii. 13, 14) (2).

(1) The book is divided organically into *four discourses*. After presenting his theme, i. 2, 3, Koheleth shows in the *first* discourse, ch. i. and ii., basing his argument on the restless change in the visible world (i. 3–11), that neither by searching after wisdom (ver. 12–18), nor by enjoying earthly good things and pleasures (ii. 1–11), can man attain to lasting good (יִתְרוֹן); although wisdom has an advantage over the folly of the desire for pleasure. In the *second* discourse, ch. iii.–v., which attaches itself to ii. 21–26, beginning with a picture of the dependence of man upon a higher and unchangeable regulation of the world and its affairs (iii. 1–8), the inquiry after this יִתְרוֹן is thus far answered, that there is no higher good for man than to enjoy himself and do good in his life (iii. 9–22). This good thing, indeed, is not easily attainable amid the many mal-adjustments which we observe in this world (iv. 1–16): yet we are to strive after it by means of the fear of God and the conscientious discharge of duty, by means of confidence in the government of the Most High; and, when we rightly estimate the worth of earthly good things, by means of contentment with the portion which God assigns to us, and happy enjoyment of the good things He lends (iv. 17–v. 19). In the *third* discourse, ch. vi. 1–viii. 15, he represents the vanity of the pursuit after riches (vi. 1–12); he developes the right practical wisdom of life (vii. 1–22); and he shows how this is to be gained in spite of all the mal-adjustments of earthly life (vii. 23–viii. 15). In the *fourth* discourse (viii. 16–xii. 7), these mal-adjustments are discussed more particularly, the maxims for that true enjoyment of life which pleases God being at the same time laid down; and there follows upon this, by way of conclusion, a condensed statement of the end

and aim of the whole teaching (xii. 8–14). For the further development of the contents and course of thought, comp. *Häv.* Einl. p. 438 ff.; and especially *Umbreit*, d. Einheit d. B. Koheleth, in the theol. Studien u. Krit. 1857, p. 7 ff.

(2) Misunderstanding of the plan of the book, which is at once rhetorical and dialectic, and of the development of its thoughts, has given occasion to many false judgments as to its plan and tendency. Already there were individual Rabbins who discovered teaching in it which was self-contradictory, or which inclined to heresy; on which account they would willingly have suppressed it. See the particulars in *Pfeiffer*, crit. sacr. p. 357; *Carpzov*, p. 222; and *Häv.* p. 450. And similar opinions made their appearance in the early Christian Church; comp. *Elster*, p. 10 ff. When, finally, in last century, men began to determine the contents and the aim of the book with greater precision, many expositors could find no unity whatever, nor any conformity to a plan (*Nachtigal*, *Stäudlin*, *Schmidt*, as also *Grotius* at even an earlier time). Others sought to introduce a certain unity into the whole, by assuming that it was a disputation between two persons holding contradictory principles (*Herder*; *Bergst*, in *Eichhorn*, Repert. x. p. 963 ff.; and *Paulus* in the neu. Repert. i. p. 201 ff.); or by transpositions and emendations of the text they tried to restore the unity which had been disturbed (*v. d. Palm*; *Umbreit*, Coheleth sceptic. p. 67 sqq.). And others conceded a certain unity, but merely one that is interrupted and disturbed by manifold digressions into impertinent observations and rules for life, such as stand in no near connection with the principal aim of the book, and some of which are mutually contradictory (*De Wette*, in *Daub u. Creuzer's* Studien, iii. p. 298 ff., and in his Einl. in d. Alte Test. § 283; *Knobel*; *Hitzig*, Vorber. zum Prediger, § 5). According to this class, the view which Koheleth takes of life inclines to fatalism, scepticism, epicureanism, and the like. Comp. *Knobel*, p. 14 ff.: and against this, *Ewald*, Koheleth, p. 177 ff.; *Häv.* p. 449 ff.; *Elster*, p. 27 ff.; and *Oehler*, d. Grundzüge d. alttestl. Weisheit, p. 29 ff.

§ 130. *Author and Date.*

Neither in the superscription of the book nor in its subsequent contents is Solomon named as the author; but the testimony everywhere is only this, that the book contains discourses of Koheleth appearing in the character of this wise king (i. 12, 16, ii. 4 ff., xii. 9, 10) (1). And there is never any concealment of the author's

poetic fiction, which makes the wise Solomon propound his thoughts upon the riddle of this life in an assembly (קָהָל). On the contrary, the author plainly enough distinguishes himself from Solomon, by designating Koheleth as him who *was* king over Israel in Jerusalem, i. 12; and still more, by making him speak upon various relations of life, in a manner in which it is impossible that the historical Solomon could have spoken (2). [These statements cannot be accepted as satisfactory proofs of *Keil's* position. The writer is certainly called Koheleth, unless evidence be adduced that the *writer* distinguished himself from the *speaker* whose words he gives: in the meantime, it is a gratuitous assumption that the book is represented as a discourse pronounced in an assembly. The proof of the distinction between Solomon and the writer here alleged to exist in ch. i. 12 is of no value, unless the translation be proved inadmissible, "I *have been* king over Israel in Jerusalem;" that is, "I was, as I still am, king." And the other proof will be considered under Note 2, to which reference is made. *Bleek*, p. 642, adds evidence of the distinction, from the expression in i. 16, ii. 9, "above *all that were in Jerusalem before me*," which he thinks that Solomon could not have used; but Jerusalem was a royal city at least from the days of Melchizedek. Besides, observe the somewhat similar expressions, 1 Kings xiv. 9, 1 Chron. xxix. 25. He also adduces xii. 9–14, "where the writer appears speaking in his own person, as distinguished from Koheleth." This statement also will be reckoned unconvincing by many, without needing to take refuge in the opinion of some critics, with which *Bleek* is not satisfied, that the conclusion is a spurious addition.]

(1) Yet the Rabbins and the older theologians were unanimous in holding that Solomon was the author (comp. *Carpzov*, p. 207), as still of late *v. d. Palm*, Eccles. p. 34; *Schelling*, Salomonis quæ supersunt, p. x.; *Welte* on *Herbst's* Einl. ii. 2, pp. 252–3; and *v. Essen*, pp. 21–2. The first to declare himself against Solomon's authorship was *Grotius* on xii. 11; then [*Herm. v. d. Hardt*, 1714, according to *Bleek*, p. 642; compare the view of the date of composition of Job given by this writer, as noticed by *Keil*, § 120, Note 4] *Döderlein*, *Eichhorn*, and almost all more recent expositors.

(2) "Solomon could scarcely complain so bitterly of oppressions, of unrighteousness in the places of judgment, of the elevation of fools and slaves to great dignity, while wealthy persons and princes

were set in a low place, unless he wished to write a satire upon himself" (*Jahn*, Einl. ii. p. 840; comp. iv. 1, v. 7, x. 5 ff.). [Those who make this objection overlook at least three things: (*a*) That Solomon need not be supposed to speak of his own kingdom exclusively, or even principally; but he may be uttering a general truth, which would be the more urged on his attention, because the vast enlargement of his dominions to the Nile and the Euphrates brought him and his people so much more than formerly into contact with the kingdoms of the world, and the state of the nations at large. (*b*) That every wise and good and energetic sovereign learns by painful experience how little he can accomplish in comparison with what he intended to do; and the very eminence of these qualities in Solomon would make it the more mortifying to find his plans thwarted by the incapacity or worthlessness of many of the agents to whom he entrusted the execution of his purposes. (*c*) According to the common belief, Solomon was an aged penitent when he wrote this book; and if his experience answered to that of so many, who are powerless to bring back others to repent along with them, though they had found it easy enough to seduce them, he may have had reason enough for writing a satire upon himself.]

The language and the subject-matter point to the times of Ezra and Nehemiah as those in which the book was composed. The language bears completely the character of the literature subsequent to the exile, not merely in its many Aramaic words and formations, but also in its peculiar philosophical expressions; while the single words which Koheleth has in common with Proverbs are drawn from the perusal of the Solomonic writings, and the study of the older apophthegmatic compositions (3). As for the subject-matter of the book, the gloomy view of the world, and the philosophy of life which meet us in it, point us at once to the times after the exile, in which the people felt how heavy was the oppression of the heathen magistrates and the arbitrary government of the Persian satraps; when, instead of seeking in their own impenitence and weakness of faith for the reason of the non-fulfilment of the ancient prophetic promises and the source of their continued external distress, they permitted themselves to be hurried away into melancholy complaints of the distressing times, and doubts as to the righteousness of the divine administration of the world,—tendencies which Koheleth opposes with his proverbs and reflections (4). Besides, the people seem to be

involved in self-righteousness and a righteousness of external works, as in Malachi's times (5). And even the appearance of dialogue (a form of discourse reminding us of the scholastic method) which meets us in the compositions of this latest prophet, offers a parallel to the didactic method in this book; and this, again, indicates a contemporaneous origin (6). There are no sufficient reasons for assigning to it a date of composition later than the time of Nehemiah or the last years of Artaxerxes (7).

(3) Later Aramaisms, for instance, are: אִלּוּ, if, vi. 6, Esth. vi. 4; בָּטַל, to cease or stand still, xii. 3, comp. Ezra iv. 24, and often; זוּעַ, to tremble, xii. 3, Esth. v. 9, Dan. v. 19; זְמָן, time, iii. 1, Neh. ii. 6, Esth. ix. 27, 31; יָשַׁר, to prosper, x. 10, xi. 6, Esth. viii. 5; מְדִינָה, province, ii. 8, v. 7; פִּתְגָם, decree, sentence, viii. 11, Esth. i. 20, Dan. iii. 16, and often; פֵּשֶׁר, interpretation, viii. 1, comp. Dan. ii. 5 ff., and often; שָׁלַט, to rule, ii. 19, v. 18, and often, comp. Neh. v. 15, Esth. ix. 1; שִׁלְטוֹן, ruler, viii. 4, 8, Dan. iii. 2, 3 [in the Eng. version it is an abstract in Ecclesiastes, which is probably better]; תָּקַן, to be straight, i. 15, vii. 13, xii. 9, comp. Dan. iv. 33; תַּקִּיף, mighty, vi. 10, Dan. ii. 40, 42, iii. 33; and the particles כְּבָר, long ago, already, i. 10, ii. 12, 16, and often, and מַה־שֶּׁ, that which, i. 9, iii. 15, and often, besides others. Philosophical expressions are: יֵשׁ, the being or existence of anything, ii. 21, viii. 14, and often; יִתְרוֹן, טוֹב, חֵלֶק, חֶשְׁבּוֹן, רְעוּת, רַעְיוֹן; and many other abstract formations, such as הוֹלֵלוֹת, madness or senselessness, x. 13; סִכְלוּת, folly, i. 17, ii. 3, and often; שַׁחֲרוּת, youth, xi. 10; שַׁפְלוּת, idleness, x. 18, and others. From the study of the Solomonic writings are taken, בַּעַל כָּנָף, for "bird," x. 20, Prov. i. 17; חָבַק יָדַיִם, "to fold the hands," as a sign of laziness, iii. 5, iv. 5, comp. Prov. vi. 10, xxiv. 33; the favourite word הֶבֶל, comp. Prov. xiii. 11, xxi. 6, xxxi. 30; מַרְפֵּא, yielding, composure, x. 4, comp. Prov. xiv. 30, xv. 4; שׁוּק, street, xii. 4, 5, comp. Prov. vii. 8, Cant. iii. 2; עַצְלָה, sloth, x. 18, Prov. xix. 15; תַּעֲנוּגוֹת, delights of love, ii. 8, Prov. xix. 10, Cant. vii. 7; the play upon words between שָׁם and שָׁמָּן, vii. 1 and Cant. i. 3, and others. Comp. *Hāv.* i. 1, p. 235. [Something more than an *ipse dixit*, however, is necessary to justify the assertion that words and phrases in Ecclesiastes resembling those in Solomon's undoubted writings are due to mere copying, instead of being an evidence to some extent in favour of his having written this book also. Nor has this evidence been presented in anything approaching to its full strength. Thus פֵּשֶׁר, here mentioned in the list of late words, on account of its once occurring in Esther, seems indeed not to occur

again as a verb: but there are three derivative nouns—פִּישׁוֹר, "spindle," found only in Prov. xxxi. 19; בְּשָׂרוֹן, thrice in this book, "prosperity;" and בּוּשָׂרָה, used in the same sense (though mistranslated in the Eng. version) in Ps. lxviii. 7, a psalm of David's. This is the extent to which the word appears in the Old Testament; yet, if it is closely connected with the verbs אָשַׂר and יָשַׂר, it is surely a harder and older form than these, ancient though they undoubtedly are. Again, יַלְדוּת, childhood, seems to occur only in Eccles. xi. 9, 10, and in another psalm of David's, cx. 3, in which it is found in connection with the very peculiar word מִשְׁחָר, as in Ecclesiastes it is connected with a word from the same root, pronounced by *Keil* here to be a late word on account of its termination, שַׁחֲרוּת. In that same psalm, ver. 4, there is the peculiar expression עַל דִּבְרָתִי, found again only in Eccles. iii. 18, vii. 14, viii. 2, and (with a certain various reading) twice in Chaldee (Dan. ii. 30, iv. 14). Again, the abstract termination וּת— is certainly much commoner in Ecclesiastes than in the other Hebrew books, but without such abstracts a philosophical writing would have been impossible; and it is a gratuitous and improbable assumption that there were no such treatises in the age of Solomon, or, if there were none, that he did not make a commencement of them, and introduce the needed vocabulary. Certainly other analogous abstracts are found in Proverbs wherever they are needed: כְּסִילוּת and פְּתַיּוּת, Prov. ix. 13; אַכְזָרִיּוּת, xxvii. 4; also לְוּת, עֲצֶלוּת (in the appendix, Prov. xxxi. 27), עַקְּשׁוּת, רִפְאוּת, שְׁחוּת: though other less strongly marked forms are also found—כִּשָּׁלוֹן, xvi. 18, like חִשָּׁבוֹן (in its construct and its plural) in Ecclesiastes, and בְּשָׂרוֹן, noticed already. Then, while there is הִלֻּלוֹת, "folly," in Eccles. x. 13, as *Keil* has mentioned, the word occurs with a change of pointing, וֹת—, i. 17, ii. 12, vii. 25, ix. 3, that is, with the ordinary plural feminine ending, yet connected with singular nouns, like סִכְלוֹת, and apparently meant to be taken as a singular noun, so that in i. 17 the other pointing וּת— is also found. This peculiarity at once recalls the usage in Proverbs of a corresponding word for "wisdom:" חָכְמוֹת, i. 17; חַכְמוֹת, xiv. 1.—It is not by any other than the rarest combinations of talents that a Lucretius arises to modify a language, so as to suit the necessities of a philosophical treatise in a poetical form; and we ought to be careful about our *à priori* reasonings in such a case.—There are not wanting affinities between the language of Ecclesiastes and that of Job: not only what *Keil* calls the favourite word הֶבֶל (copied from Solomon, according to him), but also עָמָל and כַּעַס; these words being found also in the subjective writing which prevails in many of David's psalms. And הוֹוֶה, Eccles. ii. 22, and the anomalous יהוּא, xi. 3, are closely allied to הֶוְיָא, Job

xxxvii. 6. Again, in Eccles. iv. 1 we have עֲשֻׁקִים, used not as a past participle, but as a noun, "oppressions." If *Delitzsch* be right, this occurs also in Job xxxv. 9, and nowhere else, unless it be in Amos iii. 9.—There are also linguistic peculiarities in Ecclesiastes, which do not favour the hypothesis of a late origin: as the plural appellation of God, xii. 1, בּוֹרְאֶיךָ; and the plural חֲיָלִים, found again only in Isa. xxx. 6. In fact, it is worth noticing that in *Keil's* own account of the language in the period of the exile, § 17, his marks of this in Notes 3, 4, and 6 have scarcely an example taken from Ecclesiastes. Note 5 has several, only because he overlooks the affinity between the lofty style of poetry and that of philosophical diction; if indeed the book is not to be reckoned poetical. See also some good remarks in *Pusey* on Daniel, pp. 325–7.—But though the Aramaic character of the language has been greatly exaggerated, the existence of this character is by no means to be wholly denied. A reason for it will be offered in the additions to this section, drawn from Solomon's position as king over a great variety of Shemitic tribes.]

(4) [Was not the age of Ezra and Nehemiah a rather *jubilant* age of the Church? To this period *Keil* attributes the last four psalms, § 113.] The mention made of royal commands (פִּתְגָם, viii. 11) which are not executed [Is this not rather a divine sentence?]; of slaves rising to be rulers; of incapable, indolent, luxurious, and venal princes in the land (x. 6, 7, 15–19),—unmistakeably directs us to the time in which Persian satraps ruled over Palestine, as depicted in Ezra iv., Neh. i. 3 ff., ii. 10, 19, iii. 33 ff., iv. 1 ff., vi. 1 ff., and in the book of Esther during the reigns of the Pseudo-Smerdis, Xerxes, and Artaxerxes. Less distinct are the allusions to the Persian rule in v. 7, 8, viii. 8, etc.; comp. *Häv.* p. 459. [Many will probably consider the one as indistinct as the other; see also the addition to Note 2. Certainly there are sentences in the Proverbs bearing on all these topics: it would be a delightful view of Israelitish history, could we believe that the first acquaintance the people had with corruption and oppression was under the Persian empire; but see 1 Sam. viii. 10–18.]

(5) According to iv. 17–v. 5 [or, as *Bleek* puts it, p. 642, iv. 17 and ix. 2], the temple service was zealously kept up, yet without living, hearty piety; just as in Malachi's time, ch. i. 6–ii. 9, iii. 7 ff. Comp. *Hengstb.* Christol. iii. pp. 588–9, and *Häv.* p. 460. [As before, there is nothing here peculiar to the days of Nehemiah and Malachi. Such a posture of affairs was common at all times; see the language of Amos, Isaiah, and Jeremiah often. At the time when David was only preparing for the temple services, he and his friends were led to see the necessity for composing such psalms as xv., xxiv., and l.; and

the evils here named would show themselves plentifully in connection with the temple service before the reign of Solomon was over.]

(6) "Of all the books in the Bible, Malachi manifests the greatest and most varied resemblances to Koheleth" (*Ewald*, p. 181). Also its designation of the priest as הַמַּלְאָךְ, v. 5, reminds us of מַלְאַךְ יְהוָה, Mal. ii. 7. [The passage in Ecclesiastes may quite well be understood of the Angel of Jehovah Himself, who had often appeared and been the channel of communication between Jehovah and His people in early times, but whose appearances had been extremely rare latterly, until He appeared in the end of David's reign and stayed the plague; the temple was built with its altar on that very spot, and there the great Angel of the Covenant might always be conceived of as invisibly present: the longing for similar tokens of His presence in the second temple may have found expression in the prophecy of His coming to His temple in Mal. iii. 1. But the other passage quoted from Malachi does show that this appellation came to be sooner or later given to the priest, owing to easily understood analogies; and if any one choose so to understand the passage in Ecclesiastes, there is nothing improbable in supposing that this usage began in the age of David and Solomon, when the temple services assumed their most regular and glorious form, and the priesthood attained to corresponding prominence and honour. Yet this would not furnish the slightest indication that the age of Ecclesiastes was late.—The argument that Malachi and Ecclesiastes are books of the same date, on account of the appearance of dialogue in both, is very feeble. Granting the facts to be so, dialogue is introduced much more remarkably in Solomon's Song, and in the book of Job, which *Keil* unhesitatingly attributes to the age of Solomon.]

(7) *Rosenmüller*, *Knobel*, *Ewald*, *De Wette*, *Hertzfeld*, and *Elster* place it in the latest times of the Persian period, or in the beginning of the Macedonian period; *Hitzig* actually in the year B.C. 204. The *latter* opinion is founded upon errors in so-called historical interpretations of various passages in the book, and upon other arbitrary combinations (against which, comp. *Hahn* in *Reuter's* Repert. 1848, vol. xiv. p. 104 ff.); the *former* rests upon the fact that we observe in the book germs of the rabbinical scholastic wisdom which appeared after the extinction of prophecy,—which come into view, however, already in the age of Ezra and Nehemiah, and their contemporary Malachi. Comp. *Häv.* p. 461 ff. [*Bleek*, pp. 642–3, says that Ecclesiastes was composed some time after the exile: his reasons are, the prosaic style; the Chaldaisms; the complaint of much book-making, xii. 12; and the fact that the people are represented as living under kings, who he

thinks must have been foreign kings, who occasioned lamentations such as iv. 13–16, v. 8, viii. 1 ff., 9, x. 4, 16, 17, 20. But he does not believe that the precise time can be fixed, though he seems to hesitate between *Ewald's* opinion that it was in the end of the Persian period, and the other opinion that it was somewhat later. He says that ch. iv. 13 ff. seems to point to some definite historical fact, but that it is unknown to us.]

[Although it may be impossible to attain to absolute certainty that Solomon was the author of Ecclesiastes, and although it is admitted that a question about the authorship of this book is very different from the question about the genuineness of the books of Moses, or that of the prophecies of Isaiah, or that of the book of Daniel; still, to say the least, there is an awkwardness and unpleasantness in adopting the view for which *Keil* argues, and there certainly is nothing to warrant that style of confident assertion in which recent critics generally indulge. In support of the old common opinion that Solomon was the author of Ecclesiastes, it may be urged—

I. That whereas no distinction has yet been established between the writer and an imaginary speaker whom he introduces, there are many things throughout the book which suit Solomon admirably, and which come in most naturally, yet incidentally. Not to dwell upon the description of his building, planting, and other works, ch. ii. 4–9, there is his reference to such experience of women as would be wholly unfair in general, but which was precisely what might be expected from so outrageous a polygamist as he had been, vii. 26–29, and to which there are certain correspondences in Solomon's Proverbs, while it stands out in contrast with the high ideal of woman in Canticles, and in monogamic passages like Prov. v. 19; his foreboding that the foolish Rehoboam was to be his heir, and to step into the possession of all that his wisdom had planned and executed, ii. 18, 19; his study and labour to teach his people by proverbs, etc., xii. 9, comp. 1 Kings v. 9–14 (Eng. version, iv. 29–34); the illustrations drawn from singularly various sources, such as suited him, but no other Hebrew known to us; and the emphatic reference to his own personal experience, which Solomon in such a book might be expected to make, and might most suitably make, implied in the use of the personal pronoun with the verb "*I* said," etc., which has been misunderstood

so completely as to be taken for an unemphatic usage of decaying Hebrew. Reference has indeed been made to a parallel case—the assumption of the name of Solomon in the apocryphal book of Wisdom. But this fact tells against the purpose for which it is adduced. The apocryphal writing assumed his name in order to gain favour and authority for itself, and this unjustifiable proceeding led the Jewish Church to treat it with silent contempt or to reject it publicly; and those Fathers who did receive it into the Canon no doubt were led to do so owing to this very circumstance, that their ignorance and simplicity led them to acknowledge its pretensions.

II. Much weight ought to be attached to the unbroken chain of tradition in both the Jewish and the Christian Church; and this in spite of the obscurity hanging over the title Koheleth, which is generally rendered "the Preacher," but which has also been interpreted by good authorities to mean "preaching [Wisdom]," whose mouthpiece Solomon in the book of Proverbs is continually represented as being. The Targum renders it, "Koheleth, that is, Solomon;" and the Greek-Jewish translator Symmachus paraphrases it παροιμιαστής, "the Proverb-maker," ch. xii. 10.

III. The predominant ideas in the book are connected with wisdom and the fear of God, and both of these in their practical applications; and it is notorious that these are the features of that ideal character which Solomon set before himself, 1 Kings iii., and are the predominant characteristics of the book of Proverbs. To this consideration, and that drawn from a similarity in the style and language (which yet is so very far from servile, that it is difficult to understand how it should have been explained as mere imitation), there must be added the fact that proverbs occur embedded in the book of Ecclesiastes, in such a way that no sane critic denies their genuineness; and no one can establish any difference between them and the acknowledged proverbs of Solomon, such as would suggest the inference that they proceeded from different authors.

IV. The single argument in favour of a later origin is the Aramaic character of the language, to which *Keil* has already made reference in Note 3; where, however, see the additions. But while it is conceded that this Aramaism may be explained by changing the *time* at which we date the composition of the book, thrusting it

down to the most recent period of Old Testament literature; it is a hypothetical procedure not less easy and natural, to explain it by changing the *place* in which we conceive that the book was to be read, and to allege that Solomon deliberately generalized his Hebrew into an Aramaic style, owing to the Aramaic influences which surrounded and pressed upon him (8), and owing to the influence which he desired to exert throughout his widely-extended dominions, which embraced the whole of the Aramaic communities as far as the Euphrates (9).]

[(8) *Keil* himself (§ 124, Note 4) has noticed how *Hengstenberg* explains peculiarities in Canticles by Solomon's cosmopolitan tendencies ("universalistichen Richtung"). And, in fact, it was for a considerable time the fashion among the self-styled critics to pronounce Canticles a late production, on linguistic grounds quite analogous to those alleged in dealing with Ecclesiastes; although longer and closer examination leads many of the school to admit that it belongs to the age of Solomon, or to one only a little later, while they perhaps still deny that he is himself the author. With this latter peculiarity in their belief we have no concern at present; but the former is important as showing the admitted Aramaizing influences in the age of Solomon, whether upon himself or not. It is not necessary to point out in the book of Proverbs the traces of an influence from the Shemitic peoples subjected to Solomon, or brought into close connection with him, in the two principal forms of Arabisms and Aramaisms. It may be added, however, that there is this Aramaic colouring in certain psalms, whose titles have been causelessly assailed, as if they also must be late productions: for instance, in that little one of Solomon's in which we find שֵׁנָא, with א for ה, Ps. cxxvii. 2; in the second singular pronominal feminine suffix repeatedly in Ps. ciii., which is David's; and in some words in another of David's, Ps. cxxxix. (writing on which, *Hupfeld* is displeased at *Delitzsch* justifying Aramaisms, etc., so early as in a psalm of David's), such as אֶסַּק, ver. 8; רִבְעִי, ver. 3; and רֵעַ, in the sense of "thought," vers. 2, 17,—which last is to be connected with the frequently occurring words in Ecclesiastes, רְעוּת and רַעְיוֹן.—In corroboration of this, it may be noted that there are certain Aramaic words and forms to be found in that part of 1st Kings which relates the history of Solomon, and which there is nothing unreasonable in attributing to the influence of Aramaisms in those documents of his time from which the canonical history was compiled: the word פַּחוֹת, x. 15, "governors," common after the

captivity, but not occurring before it except here (where the writer might have used נִצָּב, as he does of governors within Palestine, iv. 7 ff.), and in naming Benhadad's and Sennacherib's officers, 1 Kings xx. 24, 2 Kings xviii. 24; the proper name אֲדַד, written with א for ה, xi. 17, though the latter is the common form, and is found in this very verse; צִדֹנִין, with the Aramaic termination, xi. 33, and צֵדְנִיֹּת, ver. 1, which latter is associated with the Syrian form by *Gesenius*, Thesaurus, *s.v.*; and the variation of the vowels in the proper name Hi*ram* and Hi*rom* (the latter in vii. 40), according to an interchange which is common between Hebrew and Aramaic.]

[(9) The following considerations are submitted, as favouring the opinion that Solomon might write Ecclesiastes intentionally in an Aramaic style, because he wished to reach a wider circle of readers than his own Hebrews,—namely, the Aramean and other Shemitic nations, subject to his government, or otherwise brought into close connection with him:—(*a*) The book makes no use of the peculiarly Israelite name for God, Jehovah (comp. in part what *Keil* says of the use of Elohim rather than Jehovah in many psalms belonging to this age, § 114, Note 2; and also consider the fact that Job and Canticles, both attributed to the age of Solomon, are not Jehovistic, but Elohistic); nor of the Mosaic law, nor of any other peculiarities of the covenant people, nor of the historical course of divine revelation among them. If there be any exception to this (not, of course, taking into account those directly historical notices of the author as king over Israel in Jerusalem), it is in viii. 2, "I counsel thee to keep the king's commandment, and that in regard of the oath of God," possibly referring to the oath of God which established the throne in David's family. If so, this would enhance the probability that Solomon was the author; it certainly would exclude the supposition that the book was composed under a Persian or Macedonian king. This "cosmopolitan tendency" in handling an argument from the light of nature or primitive tradition, is suitable to him who had described heavenly Wisdom crying, "Unto you, *O men*, I call, and my voice is to the *sons of men*," Prov. viii. 4. It is closely analogous to the style of argument in the book of Job, which *Keil* agrees with most authorities now in assigning to the age of Solomon; and which even those who reckon it patriarchal might not be indisposed to connect with the reign of Solomon to this extent, that it then became known to the Israelites, or was placed among the sacred books of Israel. The connection of two such books as Job and Ecclesiastes with Solomon's reign would go far to show a missionary spirit in the Church of Israel at the time, a looking out upon the Gentiles with a view to gather them in, such as harmonizes well

with the affectionate spirit shown to the heathen in the book of Ruth (see § 136), written probably about this time, and such as we see more or less in prophecy, but most marvellously in Jonah, one of the most ancient of the prophets. (*b*) Its topic for discussion, the chief good for man, had been from the first a settled point in Israel, Ps. iv. 7, Mic. vi. 8; and there was no need, and no room, for a discussion ending so nearly in the words which were already familiar to all Israelites. There was, however, both room and need for such a treatise if it was to be placed in the hands of thoughtful inquirers (Deut. iv. 6–8; 1 Kings x. 1 ff.) from among the subject nations and the allies of Solomon. Or, in so far as it has been pled that there is something of the apologetic and defensive in the book, which is therefore supposed to be written in vindication of the old faith, and as a preservative to those who might be tempted from it; it remains yet to be shown that there was any period at which this would have been more suitable than the age of Solomon, when so many heathen influences were continually borne in upon Israel, from which the wise king himself by no means escaped. Again, compare the analogy between Job and Ecclesiastes in the dash of scepticism traceable in some of the passing statements. (*c*) Nor need we think of Ecclesiastes as a book only for a few sages, who came to inquire about Solomon and his people, and their sentiments. It might be a manual of true religion in its practical form, meant to be disseminated over his extensive dominions, among multitudes who might become proselytes in the sense that they abandoned heathenism and adopted the fundamental principles of religion as taught in Israel, though it might seem hopeless (as indeed it was never intended) to proselytize them in the mass and to the full extent of incorporating them with Israel by circumcision and all the minutiæ of the law of Moses. This *missionary* character which truly belonged to the Israelite Church is apt to be overlooked by us, as it too much was by the people themselves, on account of its predominantly *conservative* character. Yet if ever there was a time in which they remembered the old promises to Abraham, that he and his seed should be a blessing to all the families of the earth, and that he should be a father of many nations, it might well be under pious sovereigns like David and Solomon, in whose reigns these promises seemed to be fulfilled or fulfilling in the most glorious sense. Solomon might well feel his responsibility in this matter to the nations whom God had placed under his authority or his influence, after David had written of the heathen as he had done in Ps. ii., xviii., xxii., lxviii., cxxxviii., and perhaps a contemporary psalmist in Ps. lxvii.; and Solomon himself could scarcely be insensible to it, as he wrote Ps. lxxii.

Once more we refer to the analogous cosmopolitan tendencies of the contemporary book of Job. We are perhaps entitled to infer that he did exert considerable religious influence over the nations, not only, first of all, from the sure testimony of Scripture as to the queen of Sheba and others (1 Kings v. 14, x. 1, 24); but in some measure also from the multitude of traditions about him still floating in these countries, doubtful though these are on account of the Mohammedan channel through which they reach us. And since his erection of store-cities, etc., is a proof that he had hopes or anticipations that his dominion to the Euphrates was to be permanent, it is impossible that he can have overlooked the importance of the overthrow of heathenism and the spread of the worship of the God of Israel, in order to secure this object. (*d*) The book is peculiarly suitable for Solomon to have written, if we accept the old and common opinion that it was the latest composition of one who had been so fearfully a backslider, but who had received a symbolical name in infancy on account of Jehovah's love for him, 2 Sam. xii. 25, and had been brought back to God by the discipline announced to his father as embodied in the provisions of the covenant of grace, and especially for the benefit of David's seed, 2 Sam. vii. 12–16, Ps. lxxxix. 29–38. Let Ecclesiastes be regarded as the testament of the penitent backslider in his old age, the last edition perhaps of instructions which he may have already disseminated among his subjects; and we give an intelligible account of the tone of subdued melancholy which pervades it, perhaps also of a certain heaviness or negligence in the style. (*e*) While there are proverbs embedded in the book which cannot be distinguished in style from those which are acknowledged to be Solomon's, we admit that there is certainly a difference in many points; but there is not more of this than we might anticipate to find in a connected discourse, and that of a philosophic kind, necessitating the use of peculiar terms, the objections to which have already been noticed under Note 3. But it must not be forgotten that there are changes in the style of the book of Proverbs itself, some parts of it consisting of sentences much longer than in the case of most of the proverbs, and differently turned; on which account these parts of the book have been denied to be Solomon's, by a sort of reasoning which *Keil* has very justly rejected as invalid: see § 117.]

[V. Finally, the hypothesis of so recent a date as is now generally assigned to Ecclesiastes by the critics, brings with it difficulties or improbabilities peculiar to itself. Thus, (*a*) how was it that the name of a writer, of remarkable and peculiar gifts, living at the very latest

period of Jewish canonical literature, when there were so few writers of eminence, was quite unknown at the time, or forgotten so speedily? (*b*) The writer speaks of a vast multiplication of books in his day (Eccles. xii. 12). This suits the peaceful and prosperous reign of the literary and scientific Solomon, but not the times of dull depression under a foreign yoke. (*c*) How was so late a book, with so much that was difficult, or even apt to cause stumbling, admitted unhesitatingly into the Canon? (*d*) Why is there such reserve in handling topics familiar at all events to the later Jews, and frequently noticed in the later books, though quite in the line of the author's argument? Such is the doctrine of immortality, apparently enveloped in some doubt in the body of the treatise, and explicitly taught only at the end, and then without any reference to the resurrection. (*e*) Those who place the date of composition far lower than *Keil* does, must also admit that the book exhibits a wonderful freedom from the theosophy of the East, and from the Hellenistic philosophy of the Alexandrians; towards one or both of which the writers of what we call the Apocrypha (with the exception of the history of the Maccabees) manifest a decided tendency. (*f*) There may be a certain appearance of plausibility in the conception of a line of Hebrew thinkers and writers on wisdom, beginning with Solomon and ending with the latest writer of the apocryphal book of Wisdom, so long as the several Solomonic books are supposed to be a compilation proceeding from a number of these. But when *Keil* strongly maintains that the Proverbs are all Solomon's own, he so far weakens the probability that some much later isolated writer borrowed Solomon's name to be placed at the head of this book of Ecclesiastes.]

END OF VOL. I.

MURRAY AND GIBB, EDINBURGH,
PRINTERS TO HER MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE.

00111882

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 25 June, 2016